1-1-1981

School-based staff development : collaborative planning & preparation for change.

Jeanette P. Esposito
University of Massachusetts Amherst

SCHOOL-BASED STAFF DEVELOPMENT: COLLABORATIVE PLANNING & PREPARATION FOR CHANGE

A Dissertation Presented

By

JEANETTE P. ESPOSITO

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

February 1981

Education

SCHOOL-BASED STAFF DEVELOPMENT: COLLABORATIVE PLANNING AND PREPARATION FOR CHANGE

A Dissertation Presented

By

JEANETTE P. ESPOSITO

Approved as to style and content by:

Harvey B. Scribner, Chairperson of Committee

R. Mason Bunker, Member

James Leheny, Member

Mario D. Fantini, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

To John

for the love that sustains ....

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Writing this dissertation has proven to be a unique learning experience for me. My sincere thanks to my doctoral committee,

-to Harvey Scribner for his constant encouragement to "swim upstream",

-to Mason Bunker for guiding me to be my own instrument for growth,

-to James Leheny for his fresh perspectives and supportive interest.

My gratitude is also extended to Michael Walker for our stimulating discussions and his assistance in translating figures into significant findings.

ABSTRACT

School-Based Staff Development: Collaborative Planning and Preparation for Change

(February 1981)

Jeannette P. Esposito, B.A., Jersey City State College
M.A., Villanova University,
Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Professor Harvey B. Scribner

In recent years, increased interest in the education of experienced teachers has occurred as a result of our long-overdue recognition that teachers are the most important link between plans for educational improvement and students who need help. Current research stresses the need to give teachers, the ultimate implementers of change, the opportunities, support and resources to make instructional innovations their own, to develop rationales and to recreate strategies that fit their unique local contexts and needs.

It is widely acknowledged that despite the energy, commitment and money applied to past training programs for experienced teachers, these programs have not, in most cases, had a significant impact on the schools. In order to reverse this trend, many studies now cite the importance of school-site problem-solving that flows from and is related to staff-identified concerns and that utilizes teacher-administrator expertise and collegial sharing. Thus, "what to do" has become clearer; "how to do it" requires further

research. We have yet to obtain sufficient information about effective staff development programs which respond to the idiosyncracies of diverse local situations.

This study applies current research findings about how professional growth is enhanced to an examination of the planning and implementation of a two-week staff development program for approximately one hundred school staff members facing complex change. Program participants (teachers, department heads and administrators) were preparing for the opening of a new flexible-space community high school, the first of its kind in their urban school system. The changes associated with the new school (new facilities and environment, new schedule, new colleagues and new student population) required extensive adaptations in curricula as well as a repertoire of new teaching behaviors.

This study first details teacher-administrator collaborative planning and implementation of diverse program activities and, second, assesses the effects of these activities by measuring changes in teacher attitudes toward seventeen new school tasks identified by participants as key areas of focus throughout the program. The study examines the extent to which effective staff development practices identified by current research were applied in this local program and identifies the kinds of training activities

which were most effective in positively changing teacher attitudes toward new school tasks.

Data from pre- and post-treatment questionnaires reveals, first, that participants gave uniformly high ratings of importance to all of the seventeen task areas that were collaboratively identified as the foci of the program. Second, participants revealed statistically significant attitudinal change toward eight of the seventeen task areas. Attitudinal change seemed to be related to the nature of each task, the active involvement of participants during training activities and the extent to which tasks represented realistic goals, given local conditions. The third general finding was that almost no statistically significant differences in attitudinal changes regarding the seventeen task areas existed between program participants from different schools, representing different degree levels, varying amounts of teaching experience and diverse curricular areas. Thus, differentiated and flexible training activities which focused on important concerns identified by potential participants and linked to a general effort of preparation for a new school had a similar effect upon a very diverse group of participants.

Finally, this study utilizes the findings that emerge to develop new conceptualizations for future staff development practices which emphasize ongoing school-site

problem-solving and collaboration for change through the use of school/community resource centers and teacher advisors. Suggestions are also made for future research and study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

Statement of the Problem

During the sixties and early seventies, the call for reform in American education resounded throughout the nation. Millions of dollars were allocated by the federal government as well as private institutions to renew American schools and to encourage dramatic changes in curriculum and instruction. This funding during the "Decade of Reform" (1965-1975) was directed primarily toward supporting consultants and "experts" whose research led to the development of impressive curricular packages and innovative teaching modes. Once developed, these new ideas held great promise for improvement and change. This promise, we discover in retrospect, has not been fulfilled.

Attempts of outside change agents to "impact on the schools" and to foster lasting change have met with strong resistance from the ultimate implementers of change, the classroom teachers. This resistance is not really surprising when we consider that the experts' technologies and validated programs, often referred to as "teacher-proof," were designed to skip a key step in the process of implementation--teacher adoption. Their materials and approach

communicated a clear message that teachers were merely technicians who should follow directions in a syllabus whether or not they understood its underlying rationale or found its content and techniques to be appropriate for their skills or their particular students' needs. In response to such treatment, teachers neither actively opposed the experts' prescriptions nor effectively adopted them. Instead, they responded with a strong form of passive resistance. Pilcher (1975) describes past change efforts and their effects in the following way:

> The American public school teacher has for years been the 'nigger' of the system. Nowhere is this more obvious than in his relationship with university and other experts. Deferentially he scrapes and bows, listening politely and following obediently the dictates of the obviously superior minds of the outsiders. Just as predictably, when the outside expert leaves, the teacher typically reverts to his old ways. (p. 287)

The present research available to us has now confirmed what the uninvolved practitioners must have known from the start: ignoring those who understand their schools best and creating solutions for theoretical problems predisposes us to failure. In the current cry for "back to basics" because curricular reforms have failed, a crucial question to ask is "Were the reforms ever really tried?" Have we given teachers the opportunities, support and resources to make the innovations their own, to develop rationales and to recreate strategies that fit their unique local contexts and needs? It is time to acknowledge that, for the most part, we have

not. The key lesson that we have learned from the failure of reform efforts is, as McLaughlin (1978) points out, ". . . the problem of reform or change is more a function of people and organizations than of technology" (p. 69).

Dealing effectively with people and organizations calls for ongoing and responsive staff development offered in new formats that give genuine ownership of the change process as well as appropriate support services to the real implementers of change.

Renewed interest in the crucial role of staff development in the process of school reform has emerged for two reasons. First, based on past failures, we have come to recognize that a long developmental process of training and support is necessary to overcome resistance to change. Schiffer (1978) criticizes our past assumption that "the rational assessment of an idea is the critical factor in attitude and behavior change." That is, if we can convince teachers that an innovation meets school needs and is clearly superior to their present methods, we assume that they will embrace it and work assiduously to develop these innovative skills. However, she cautions,

> This 'rational assumption' underestimates the degree to which individuals' values, self-interest, previous experiences, expectations, aspirations, needs and personality traits influence their acceptance or rejection of an idea, as well as their ability to use it. . . .Therefore it is likely that past history is the best predictor of future behavior, unless some fairly powerful interventions take place" (pp. 6-7).

Second, a new phenomenon in our schools, the dramatic drop in student numbers and the resultant decline in the hiring of new teachers with fresh ideas and new techniques, has deprived administrators of an easy and relatively painless way to institute desired changes. Systems that can no longer rely on high teacher turnover for flexibility and renewal are now compelled to better utilize and continue to stimulate their existing stable, tenured staff.

What schools must do is clear. "How to do it" remains an unanswered question. It is widely acknowledged that despite the energy, commitment and money applied to past training programs for experienced teachers, they have not, in most cases, had a significant impact on the schools. Recent studies have documented certain characteristics of change agent projects that have succeeded. Two of the most comprehensive are the 1975 Rand Study of federally funded programs in 293 school districts around the country and the five-year I/D/E/A Study of Educational Change and School Improvement (1967-1972) which researched elementary schools in 18 school districts in Southern California. Working in almost total independence from one another, and utilizing different research methodologies, both studies resulted in very similar recommendations for the effective practice of staff development. Both studies stressed the importance of school-site problem-solving that flows from and is related

to staff-identified problems and that utilizes teacher-administrator expertise and collegial sharing (Williams, 1978, pp. 99-100). Their findings, and those of many others, provide a valuable basis for future work. Our next step is to translate the current body of recommendations into the "nuts and bolts" of local staff development implementation.

Purpose of the Study

This study will apply current research findings about how professional growth is enhanced to the planning, implementation and examination of a two-week staff development program for school staff members (teachers, department heads and administrators) who are preparing for complex change. In particular, the study will focus on:

(1) teacher-administrator collaborative planning of program activities

(2) implementation of diverse program activities

(3) methodologies for data collection during planning and implementation process

(4) creation and administration of pre- and post-treatment questionnaires measuring teacher attitudes

(5) analysis of data collected during program planning, implementation and evaluation to answer research questions

Each of these processes is documented and examined within the framework of our current knowledge of staff development

activities. Specifically, the following research questions guide the focus and purpose of this study:

(1) How can current research findings about staff development activities that enhance professional growth be applied to a local staff development program?

(2) What are the effects of a collaboratively-planned staff development program, as measured by teachers' attitudes toward new school tasks before and after the program?

(3) Do teachers with diverse past experiences (department affiliation, years of teacher experience, degree levels or former school assignments) reveal different levels of attitudinal change as a result of their participation in the staff development program?

(4) What kinds of staff development activities are most effective in positively changing teacher attitudes?

(5) What new conceptualizations for future staff develpment research and practice emerge from this study?

Background of the Study

The local staff development program to be studied was conceived in response to the needs of one school faculty who were preparing for a complex change. The school staff were preparing for a change in space, a move from the eighty-year-old City High School with its self-contained classrooms and classroom-sized library to the new City Community High School which featured large department "pods" containing as many as ten different learning stations for separate classes. The new facility contained an elaborate library-media center with a rich array of teaching equipment, its own television studio and a digital computer with eight

terminals that could be used for instructional purposes. Faculty were to experience a change in scheduling, from a traditional block of seven periods (forty-two minutes in length) to a "differentiated semi-rotating schedule" (with periods ranging from forty-two to sixty-five minutes) placed in different time blocks on A, B, C, and D days. They were to experience a change in the student population which was increased by one-third and which incorporated one hundred special needs and one hundred bilingual students who were to be mainstreamed into regular classes, as well as adult community members invited to take courses with regular students during the school day. As a result, these changes required extensive adaptation in curricula as well as a repertoire of new teaching behaviors and materials.

The two-week staff development program represented a unique opportunity for the staff to work together for a prolonged period of time within the new school site to prepare for extensive change. Teachers in this school system ordinarily participate in staff development activities during three separate release-time days (in October, March and May) during which they attend a variety of system-wide presentations and workshops located in a central location apart from their school site and their school colleagues. In the past, these release-time days have been organized by school system subject-matter-coordinators and the Centre City Schools

Staff Development Office with little or no involvement of participants in the planning or implementation process. The two-week program which has been studied represented a significant departure from past practice in that members of the school staff played a central role as planners, organizers and implementers of school-based activities. The program also represented a special challenge to the planners to design a process that met with the approval of the administration and the teaching staff.

The steps taken to assess administrator and teacher concerns and to develop and organize relevant activities were examined from the perspective of current research on effective school-site training for experienced teachers. Thus, this study sought to add to our knowledge of appropriate or inappropriate staff development practices applied to a local context. It examined the effectiveness of staff development procedures and practices as determined by changes in participants' attitudes toward new school tasks which they were planning to perform in their new high school.

Significance of the Study

McLaughlin (1978) has recently pointed out that "the desultory status of staff development as education's neglected stepchild is changing" (p. 69). Renewed interest in the education of experienced teachers has come from our

long-overdue recognition that they are the most important link between educational improvement and students who need help. Unless we provide the school staff with training and support that encourages growth and change, the entire chain of educational improvement--from conception to realization --is broken. However, since staff development has so long been a "stepchild," it is still in the primary stages of development. We have yet to obtain sufficient information about effective programs within what Rubin (1978) calls "the idiosyncracies of the particular environment" (p. 22). Current suggestions for successful staff development procedures must be applied and adapted to diverse local situations. Answers to the question "What methods work best?" can only be found by examining the setting, the problems and goals, the people involved and the ways in which all of these elements combine and interact with each other. As Piaget has said, "to understand is to invent." This study is significant because it contributes to our understanding through reinvention.

More specifically, this study adds to our knowledge on two levels. First of all, it investigates questions that represent real concerns within one large urban school system striving for renewal and change. Because the two-week program to be studied was conceived and developed with the cooperation of the local Staff Development Office

and because it documented a local model of collaborative planning, assessment of attitudes and needs and active learning among participants, its findings can help to influence and change future district practices in other schools and communities. Second, this study provides realistic documentation of a school-based program modeled on new national trends. Therefore, it can extend and reinforce, or modify, present theories and can, in turn, stimulate new conceptualizations, applications and research.

Meaning of Key Terms

The following terms are used frequently throughout this study:

Staff Development. Although such terms as "inservice education" and "teacher education" are often used interchangeably to describe training programs designed for experienced teachers to encourage professional growth and change, this study uses the term "staff development." It is the author's belief that this term is most appropriate because it emphasizes training designed within the context of the total school (staff) and training that encourages long-term ongoing growth possibilities (development).

Collaborative Planning: This program planning process is one of conceiving and formulating plans, seeking resources and making decisions about which workshop activities

to select and support. Planning is "collaborative" in that program plans were made with equal input from teachers, department heads, and assistant principals in the school who function as partners throughout the planning process.

Staff Development Program: A generic term used to refer to the two-week period during which all of the staff development activities take place.

Work Session: A block of time within the staff development day during which staff members and a leader met to focus on pre-arranged agenda items reflecting their concerns. Activities during work sessions included signing space in department pods, planning traffic patterns or noise control strategies, setting up teaching teams, creating curricular materials, etc.

Workshop: An individual training session utilizing local resource people and some outside consultants who worked with small groups to provide needed information and develop important skills.

General Session: A meeting with the entire faculty designed to allow exchange of information about school operations that was relevant to the total staff.

General Feedback Session: A meeting of the entire staff designed to encourage exchange between staff members of diverse departments regarding their plans for space design, classroom management, department programs, etc.

Faculty Briefing: A meeting between school administrators and the entire staff created to provide information about school organizational issues to facilitate exchange of ideas and concerns between teachers, assistant principals, and principal.

Pod: A large open instructional area housing as many as ten "learning stations" containing separate classes and teachers.

Flexible Space: A term used to describe large open areas with movable hanging dividers that can create large and small teaching areas appropriate for diverse learning activities.

Delimitations of the Study

This descriptive study is exploratory by intention and design. It raises questions to be answered rather than hypotheses to be tested. Both advantages and disadvantages exist in a study which describes an actual local program rather than a strictly controlled research project. First of all, no control group is utilized. Therefore, findings and conclusions must be judged from the perspective of this limitation. However, the study gains advantage in that it deals with data collected from a reality-based situation. Rubin (1978) points to the significance of this exploratory research when he stresses that ". . . the search for tactics

that are free from failure--irrespective of the contextual scene and the human elements--is not likely to be of any real avail" (p. 22).

This study has directed itself toward uncovering and describing phenomena that existed in a school-based program that was one component within a larger system-wide staff development program. It covered a period of four months during which the conception, planning, development and implementation of the staff development program took place. It focused on a number of tasks which school staff members identified as important areas they wished to address in preparing themselves to function effectively in their new school environment.

The research questions which have been advanced for investigation define the scope of the study and findings that emerge have been considered as formative indicators of the current effectiveness of an ongoing process that can build new theory and practice.

The study does not claim that it has uncovered what is true for all school-based staff development programs. Rather, by concentrating on a specific case and depending upon the perceptions of the people who are closely involved in the regularities of the school, the study has described the present reality of a school-based program and therefore

provides a basis for further application and inquiry by other educators.

In view of the fact that the author of this dissertation was also the coordinator of the program to be studied, personal bias must also be considered as a possible limitation of this study. The author has acknowledged this issue from the beginning and has therefore made a serious and sustained effort to consciously avoid biased description and analysis.

Design of the Study

In order to document effective ways to apply current research in planning and implementing a school-based staff development program, to assess the effect of the program as indicated by attitudes of participants before and after the program and to use information from data collected to build new conceptualizations, the following procedures will be used in the proposed study:

Sampling of Participants. Selecting from among the approximately one hundred faculty members who voluntarily participated in all or part of the two-week staff development program, this study has focused on those individuals who (1) collaboratively planned and helped to implement the program, (2) attended two full weeks of the program, (3) answered both the pre- and post questionnaires and (4) responded to at least three of the five items contained in

each question. This last criterion was established so that respondents' answers could be utilized in a scale created to measure attitudes. For purposes of comparison and contrast, respondents have been identifed both as a large group and as members of sub-groups divided by department affiliation, years of teaching experience, highest degree held and status as former City High School staff or staff from other Centre City schools.

Processes in Planning. The steps taken to develop a collaborative planning process have been detailed. These include: selection of a planning group (representing administrators, department heads and teachers), meetings of the group to identify and prioritize major issues in preparing for school change, sessions to conceptualize a variety of appropriate activities enabling individuals and groups to learn new information and develop new skills, collaborative creation of a flexible program design submitted for administrator and teacher approval and delineation of resource people, materials and settings needed to operationalize the program.

Implementation Strategies. The focus, content and interactions within each of the various sessions (department work sessions, individual workshops, general feedback sessions, faculty briefings, etc.) that address the staff's prioritized concerns have been documented. Descriptions

cover the emphasis upon differentiated training experiences to meet different needs, self-initiated and self-directed activities and peer instruction and sharing in a variety of large and small group activities that seek to accommodate a diversity of needs and agendas.

Instrumentation. Pre- and post-treatment instruments were administered to the total staff before workshop activities began and after they were completed.

Questionnaires asked staff members to record a "personal I.D. number" (known only to them) on their answer sheets. This number, recorded on both the pre- and post-instruments, enabled the writer to compare pre- and post-attitudes and to assess the possible attitudinal changes that occurred between the beginning and end of the program.

Instruments were designed to discover staff attitudes toward key areas of change identified by the planning group and approved by the faculty as major priorities for focus. The areas of concern have been translated into "tasks." Preparation for these tasks provided the underlying rationale for the staff development program, since they represented key areas the school staff decided to address to prepare for the new school.

Analysis of Data: Participants' reponses to pre- and post-instruments have been coded for input into the University of Massachusetts Control Data Corporation Cyber 175

Computer, utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Appropriate statistical procedures including frequency counts, mean scores, standard deviations, cross-tabulations, T-tests and one-way analysis of variance have been used to measure changes in pre- and post-responses to questionnaires.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation consists of the following six chapters:

Chapter I: Description of the Study. Chapter I presents a discussion of the current problems of educational change and the role of staff development in helping to solve these problems. It describes the purpose of this study and provides information on the study's background or local context, the significance of examining staff development procedures within the idiosyncracies of a particular environment and the meaning of key terms used in this examination. In addition, the delimitations, design and organization of the dissertation are described.

Chapter II: Review of the Literature. Through a review of current research, Chapter II provides a rationale for this study and a theoretical base for its analysis. This chapter focuses upon an examination of problems associated with past

teacher-training practices, a description of new understandings about the realities of teaching and teachers' resistance to change and a delineation of recent findings that point toward successful staff development practices.

Chapter III: Planning and Implementation of a Staff Development Program. Chapter III presents the local context to be studied: the city, the school system, the facilities, personnel and student populations of the schools in focus and the elements of change they face. The chapter also describes steps taken during the inception, planning and implementation of the City Community High School Staff Development Program and concludes with a description of specific training activities offered in response to the seventeen task areas of concern identified by the planning group.

Chapter IV: Methodology. Chapter IV defines the methodology used to design and administer pre- and post-questionnaires which measure changes in teachers' attitudes toward new school tasks. In addition, it describes the statistical procedures (frequency counts, mean scores, standard deviations, cross-tabulations, T-tests and one way analysis of variance) used for analysis of data collected.

Chapter V: Display and Discussion of Data. Using appropriate tables, Chaper V displays and analyzes data obtained from questionnaires. Descriptions include a focus on demo-

graphics of program participants, levels of participant interest in program topics, significant and insignificant differences in attitude changes. Differences in five areas of attitudinal change are discussed in terms of the total group of participants as well as demographic sub-groups in order to determine the effects of the program as measured by T-tests and one-way analysis of variance.

Chapter VI: Conclusions and Recommendations. Chapter VI discusses the implications for staff development which emerge from the research results in this study and from a comparison of present staff development theory and actual practice in a local program. Recommendations for future staff development practices within the school and school district are made and suggestions for further research are presented.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

An understanding of any staff development program requires a knowledge of "where we are" and "where we want to be." To examine "where we are" it is helpful to review current literature that provides us with an understanding of teachers' preservice and inservice training and of the realities of teaching today. Such a review builds a conceptual framework for understanding teachers' past and present resistance to "change" efforts as well as their current staff development needs. In addition, current research findings that describe successful staff development practices encouraging professional growth offer us a set of beliefs about staff development that serve as a guide toward "where we want to be." The set of beliefs presented in this chaper serve as key guiding principles to be utilized in an analysis of the local staff development program which is the focus of this study.

In order to discuss the above issues, this chapter will deal with the following questions: first, what experiences develop teachers' "fixed" conceptions of their roles and a consequent resistance to change? Second, why has

preservice and inservice training failed to foster ongoing professional growth and adaptability to change? Third, given these realities, what kinds of training activities can help teachers in our schools to incorporate new approaches and behaviors into the fabric of their teaching?

Factors in Teacher Resistance to Change

Sarason (1971) maintains that "Those who attempt to introduce a change rarely if ever begin the process by being clear as to where the teachers are, that is, how and why they think as they do" (p. 193). Those who plan to support teachers in a change process must understand and acknowledge key forces which may militate against an easy acceptance of change strategies. Important "restraining forces" include the influence of former teachers, the traditional physical environment of the classroom, past pre-service and inservice training and on-the-job initiation. These factors will be explored in the pages which follow.

The influence of former teachers. An examination of why teachers think as they do must begin with a recognition of the strong influence that former teachers have on our impressions of a teacher's role. Blume (1971) contends, "Teachers teach the way they have been taught--not the way they have been taught to teach" (Combs, 1974, p. 147). Evidence that teachers model their teaching on personal

impressions of the past is found in a survey conducted by Lortie (1975) which focused on ninety-six elementary, junior and senior high teachers working in five different school systems. More than half the teachers polled, even though they were not asked directly, volunteered information about the continuing influence of former teachers on their own techniques. Typical comments were:

> I had one college professor. . . . This is the man who had more to do with my techniques than any other person.
>
> There was one particular teacher. . . . She was very hard, very strict. . . . She probably taught me how important classroom discipline was.
>
> The teachers I had made me subconsciously. (p. 64)

Lortie (1969) contrasts the "wildly romantic and inaccurate" view that future doctors and lawyers have of their professions with the more accurate pictures that future teachers have received, based on 13,000 hours of direct experience with teachers and professors (p. 34). However, in a later study, Lortie (1975) adds that these impressions are formed by students' projections into the teachers' roles and are therefore based more on imagination about how the teacher feels in performing his/her task than on a transfer of technical knowledge. Therefore, a student's "apprenticeship of observation" in Lortie's (1975) view,

> . . . is more a matter of imitation, which being generalized across individuals, becomes tradition. It is a potentially powerful influence which transcends generations, but the conditions of transfer do not favor informed criticism, attention to specifics or explicit rules of assessment. (p. 63)

Such imitation, without the accompanying technical understanding or informed assessment, can serve as a strong restraining force against new teaching behaviors.

The physical environment of traditional classrooms. Another factor that communicates the message that teachers should teach as they were taught is the physical arrangement of many classrooms which subtly implies a certain kind of pedagogy. Surprisingly, classrooms containing rows of student desks which face the teacher's desk (firmly planted as central focus in the front of the room) are still very common in many elementary and most secondary schools. Not surprisingly, such a visual image reinforces the memories of former teachers and the traditional, teacher-centered, information-delivery mode of instruction. The fact that such classrooms are still so common seems to reflect the lack of practical, reality-based training that new and experienced teachers should have received so that they are able to adapt or re-design their classrooms into a learning environment that supports new teaching techniques. The existence of so many "unchanged" classrooms seems to demonstrate that teacher training in, for example, individualization, has not sufficiently focused upon the "nuts and bolts" (beyond paper) ways to differentiate student learning and to encourage self-direction and independence. Issues of area definition, work surface, material display and storage in

contemporary classrooms need serious consideration if teachers and students are to accept a learning process that takes place in different ways and at different paces throughout the school year.

Past pre-service training. Both new and experienced teachers have very vocally expressed their dissatisfaction with the training they have received. Given their "apprenticeship of observation" it is crucially important that ongoing teacher training provide both sound technical knowledge and clear applications of what teaching and learning should be. Yet, the content and structure of many training programs teachers have evaluated indicates that they are not viewed as supports that encourge adaptability and change. Many professors, themselves reflecting the tradition, merely "lecture" about alternative teaching modes. Experienced teachers describe the education courses they took as "Mickey Mouse" (Silberman, 1970, p. 441), as "too theoretical" (Hermanowicz, 1966, p. 15) and too removed from classroom situations (Ladd, 1966, p. 76). According to Leiter and Cooper (1978),

> Concepts of the whole child and individualized education strategies brought a change in teaching children but little of this has impacted on the training of teachers. Adult learning has not been given the same attention in terms of motivation and self-selection of goals. Most adult learning situations presuppose that adults ought to want to learn because they are adults and in teacher-learning this assumption is then coupled with a

> low estimate of their capacity. The result is the species of superficial instruction that constitutes most professional development work (p. 121).

To the present day, ". . . the low rating given by teachers to many of their education courses fuels the perennial criticism of education courses and educators in general" (Broudy, 1978, p. 59).

Many educational programs have not given strong emphasis to the key areas of psychology of teaching and learning or human growth and development. Teachers in the classroom, as a result, often lack the technical knowledge and vocabulary which would help them to apply teaching and learning principles in their classes and to intepret classroom events clearly with colleagues. Jackson (1968) points out the "conceptual simplicity" of teachers' conversations about teaching which he translates into four aspects relevant to our understanding of teachers' resistance to change. These are:

> (1) an uncomplicated view of causality. . . . As they struggle to explain a puzzling classroom episode, they commonly settle on what they consider to be the explanation . . .; (2) an intuitive, rather than rational approach to classroom events [which is oftentimes based upon many years of practical experience]; (3) an opinionated as opposed to an open-minded stance when confronted with alternative teaching practices; and (4) a narrowness in the working definitions assigned to abstract terms. [For example] Motivation, in pedogogical shop talk, typically refers to a student's zest for undertaking school assignments, and little else. (pp. 144-146)

Lack of clearly-defined terms that describe the teaching-learning process encourages unclear thinking and reinforces subjective and closed-minded convictions that resist change. On the other hand, mutual understanding of technical terms and concepts can more forcefully counter subjective attitudes about teaching. A vocabulary that differentiates between students' varied learning styles (visual, auditory or tactile-kinesthetic) leads one to logically challenge dependence upon the lecture-delivery of information to the entire class. Thus, teachers need a "common technical culture" of practical information that can be developed through a "sustained, empirical, practice-oriented inquiry into problems and alternatives" (Lortie, 1975, p. 69). More specifically, Anderson (1978) notes that

> So long as colleges and universities, especially the departments and schools of Education (sic) within them, remain aloof and distinct from those reforms associated with individualized learning, their example and influence will be largely negative: their alumni will be poorly prepared for serving children as unique individuals. (p. 51)

Since it does give them a brief opportunity to be active learners, testing new teaching behaviors, many teachers cite practice teaching as their most valuable training. However, in addition to brevity, it too has many other shortcomings that result in a perpetuation of past practices. Ideally, during their practicum, students are given alternative pictures of teaching and learning by working with a college supervisor (who should theoretically spend a

great deal of time helping them to apply theory to the lessons and techniques they plan) and with the cooperating teacher (who should demonstrate the use of many alternatives). In reality, the supervisor may only have time to "observe" and later discuss the student's teaching once or twice and the cooperating teacher, often not selected for mastery or creativity in teaching, and given little or no compensation for this demanding job, may merely reinforce the limited traditional view of teaching that students have observed for years. Thus, we are led to the conclusion drawn by Lortie (1975) that:

> There is little indication that it [student teaching] is a powerful force away from traditionalism and individualism. . . . The student is not forced to compare, analyze and select from diverse possibilities. (p. 71)

On-the-job initiation. Analysis of the next phase in a teacher's career, his or her first teaching position, also provides a valuable perspective on why teachers develop a strong dependence upon certain set techniques and why their attitudes about their roles tend to solidify. Ironically, because preservice and inservice training are not viewed as parts of a continuum, once the new teacher finally has an adequate opportunity to experiment with his or her own class, all supervisory support from a college or university is withdrawn. Jeffers and McDaniels (1975) acknowledge this problem when they point out:

> Those closely involved in preparing teachers have recognized for years that . . . preservice programs can only provide the new practitioner with competencies necessary for beginning professional practice. Those competencies will suffice only if the beginner is appropriately assigned, adequately supervised and individually assisted. Unfortunately, none of these conditions exists in most situations. (p. 30)

In agreement, H. S. Broudy (1978) characterizes preservice training as "a survival kit fashioned to keep the teacher alive until the inservice rescue squad can supply first aid and resuscitation" (p. 58). However, inservice support is usually not immediately available. The new teacher, who is armed with a reservoir of personal impressions of the "good teacher," varying amounts of theoretical knowledge about teaching and learning and a short practice teaching experience with the vicissitudes of a real classroom, usually struggles to handle "the first day" alone. Most school systems seem not to acknoweldge the new teacher's need for any special support. He/she is expected to carry out the same complex responsibilities as the 25-year veteran who may teach next door. However, the two will probably not work together. As the new teacher attempts to deal with what Jackson (1968) estimates amounts to as many as 1,000 interpersonal interchanges with students in one day (p. 149), he is likely to, as Dewey (1904) explains, "Adjust his actual methods of teaching not to . . . principles . . . but to what he sees succeed and fail in an empirical way from moment to moment" (Silberman, 1970, p. 459). McPherson (1972)

agrees, "No teacher ever does what she thinks is best. We do the best we can in the circumstances. What you think is a good idea from the outside turns out to be impossible in the classroom" (p. 197).

Sarason (1971) stresses that

> The first two years of teaching are a baptism of fire in which many things can be consumed, including some of the ingredients that make for a good and even outstanding teacher. The important point is that what happens in these years, for good or for bad, cannot be understood by narrowly focusing on the teacher, but by seeing the teacher as part of a matrix of existing relationships, practices and ideas. (p. 171)

Searching for teaching strategies that work in the classroom, the new teacher is especially receptive to the influence of the already-established social system of the school and to the messages (expressed or implied) that come from more experienced colleagues. In this regard, Lieberman and Miller (1978) describe two informal school rules that seem to play a significant role in shaping and reinforcing teacher attitudes and behavior: "being practical" and "being private."

Teachers who are practical deal with problems immediately at hand (maintaining order, stressing achievement) and use concrete solutions (discipline, grading) which seem most expedient and possible within the existing structures of the school. Problems of individualization, different learning styles and maximizing each student's potential are often viewed as idealistic and unrealistic. For these problems,

there are no easy solutions and little existent school support (through flexible scheduling, revitalized facilities, differentiated materials, release time for planning and sharing, etc.). Faced with hard realities, a rule of practicality evolves which says,

> Striving to change the system is idealistic; striving to 'make do' is practical. . . . The process of reflective self-criticism is idealistic; the expressed belief that 'I do the best I can. It's the kids that don't try' is practical. Being open to change and to outsiders is idealistic; being self-sufficient is practical. (Lieberman & Miller, 1978, pp. 59-60)

Thus, the value placed on practicality, which is reinforced by daily confronting the realities in the schools, leads to the value placed on resisting change, maintaining the status quo and ignoring new ideas, teaching techniques, and the resource people who propose them.

It is also practical to "be private," not to share experiences about teaching, classes, students or professional roles with anyone inside the school building. Those who are now or who have been teachers are likely to recall that conversations in teachers' rooms seldom deal seriously with instructional techniques or curriculum development. Sessions in the teachers' lounges are "time out" periods, times to joke or complain. "Idealistic" teachers who initiate a professional dialogue may very well be jokingly rechanneled into more acceptable modes of conversation. As one teacher explained, "We need time to recharge for the next assault.

We don't want to talk about anything serious. We want to take a break, kibbutz, and then go back to our job" (Lieberman & Miller, 1978, p. 61).

Once teachers do return to their jobs in the classroom, they might have an opportunity to share professional concerns if they visited each other's classrooms. However, this type of sharing is often strongly resisted. While it would enable teachers to display their successes, it also leaves them very vulnerable to revealing their failures. Visitations to classrooms that do exist as a school regularity consist of visits by the principal or department head and are therefore equated with evaluation and the need to "pass the test." Indeed, one does not take more tests than are required! It is safer to be "private."

Given the other regularities of a school day--a teacher's tightly scheduled assignments which fill almost every time block with classes or supervisory duties (studies, homeroom, recess, student lunch periods, etc.) and clerical tasks, little additional time exists for collegial sharing. Professional concerns are usually dealt with during faculty meetings which Sarason (1971), using the perspective of his man from outer space, describes in this way:

> Approximately ten times in the year . . . all the teachers meet with someone who ordinarily spends practically all of his time in a room with no children. On these occasions this person . . . does most of the talking. In fact, there are some teachers who in the ten meetings never say anything. (p. 105)

Many current studies have strongly emphasized that teaching is a lonely profession. Today, despite the pressures to assume many new roles, most teachers are still structurally organized as they were in colonial times. Most still function as solo practitioners as they did in the one-room dame schools and Latin grammar schools of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This tradition became so strong that even in the nineteenth century, when schools expanded into multi-unit structures, teachers remained in separate rooms. Given the scheduling and organization of many modern schools, most teachers remain

> . . . alone with their children and the problems in a classroom, and the frequency and pattern of contact with others like themselves are of a kind and quality that make new learning and change unlikely. (Sarason, 1971, p. 107)

Anderson (1978) adds that "Given that many superior alternatives exist, the continuing dominance of self-contained classrooms is an impediment to all kinds of educational progress" (p. 49). Deprived of collegial or even substantial supervisory support, both new and experienced teachers are forced to "cope" by drawing on personal resources to develop techniques that work for them.

As a result, data from interviews of numerous teachers indicated clearly that they judge the value of suggested changes not on the basis of sound educational principle, but through the "screen" of their own self-concept. New

practices, according to Lortie (1975) were accepted only if they were consistent with the teacher's personal style and teaching situation (pp. 77-78).

The imposition of change from above (the superintendent's or principal's office or the university) still so prevalent in our schools today, like our conception of the teacher as a lonely practitioner, has strong historical roots. Edelfelt (1975) explains that

> In the early days, the school board was, in effect, a church board, to which the teacher looked for any decision-making that was needed beyond the guidance of church policy. When the school became secular, the teacher still looked to the board and superintendent for decisions regarding curriculum and instruction. (p. 12)

Such decisions could more easily be followed in the past because curriculum and teaching were viewed as fixed and unchanging. According to R. W. Tyler (1971),

> In the midperiod of the nineteenth century, the idea that the curriculum and teaching procedures should be in continuous development was not commonly accepted. The technological and social changes in those days were proceeding less rapidly than now and school learning was considered desirable but not necessary for an individual's survival. . . . How to educate those who dropped out was not perceived as a meaningful question. (pp. 6-7).

Now that schools acknowledge the importance of meeting the needs of all students and emphasize teaching as a changing and developing task, they need leaders and not followers to accomplish their goals. Yet, teachers are seldom given the encouragement to "lead." Their roles in developing curriculum or new teaching techniques are still bound by

historically-established parameters. Today, in most school systems the school board and superintendent establish rules for all schools. Curriculum planning for a school system is usually controlled by curriculum coordinators or other central office personnel. Curriculum guides detailing material that must be covered at each grade level continue to proliferate. Within the school, the principal, who is the "instructional leader" of the school, determines policies, procedures and the "educational style" of the school.

Teachers readily admit the key importance of their relationship to their principal who makes many decisions (allocation of space, materials, equipment, and resources of time) that affect the social life of the school and its staff. (Lieberman & Miller 1978) He or she is the daily visible authority who can either support and praise or ignore and frustrate teacher attempts to try new methods. Psychologically, principal interactions with teachers have a powerful effect. As one teacher explains,

> If I see him in the hall and he doesn't smile or look at me, I'm upset all day. What did I do wrong? Why doesn't he like me? Will he listen to me if there's a problem? I know it shouldn't affect me but it does. (Lieberman & Miller, 1978, p. 63)

Berman and McLaughlin (1978) point out that the importance of the principal in both long and short run successes of new programs "can hardly be overstated." Attitudes of principals who are the "gate-keepers" of change are crucial in the

stages of implementation and continuation of new practices since they give subtle but nonetheless powerful signals about the "legitimacy" of teacher efforts. Teachers interpret these messages as they decide if change is in their professional self-interest, if it is worth the effort and if it will make a difference (pp. 30-31).

A strong measure of a principal's support for teacher-initiated change comes from his or her participation in planning and training sessions. This kind of involvement provides the "educational leader" with skills and information needed to understand and support teacher efforts. Principal participation communicates that change is a school priority requiring the cooperation and work of all school personnel. In addition, a principal's involvement in training enables him or her to sustain ongoing activities with new staff and to knowledgeably seek district financial support.

Such findings reflect the problems with past inservice programs which have been planned and carried out without principal-initiation or teacher participation. Staff developers are often central office personnel who design "release-time" days and system-sponsored equivalent credit courses in isolation from the people in the schools. "Change agents" from schools of education or universities design workshops or graduate courses or federal programs

predominantly for teachers. Training for administrators in a school system, when it does exist, is usually viewed as an entirely separate entity.

Past in-service training. Training teachers for leadership requires a change in many assumptions about inservice education which have also been based upon past historical realities. H. G. Richey's (1957) historical view of inservice education reveals that:

> During the nineteenth century inservice programs of teacher training reflected, above all else, the prevailing and partially valid assumption that the immaturity, meager educational equipment and inexperience of the teacher rendered him unable to analyze or criticize his own teaching or, unless given direction, to improve it. (p. 36)

Although the majority of teachers are today capable professionals who should be encouraged to work with their principal to plan their own professional improvement, the tradition in which authorities from above direct the purposes, content, and methods of inservice programs for teachers below is still strong. Leiter and Cooper (1978) characterize former models of teacher education as "highly mechanical and structured role models--education as received doctrine" (p. 121). The lowly position to which teachers are still relegated in relationship to university professors and school administrators discourages them from taking a position of leadership in initiating change. Although the success of any program depends upon the teachers who must implement the

changes, they are seldom asked to identify school goals and to develop plans of action to accomplish them. Their non-involvement communicates a lack of belief in their ability to grow and develop and beomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Therefore,

> . . . one person's expectations for another person's behavior can quite unwittingly become a more accurate prediction simply for its having been made. (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968, p. vii)

Often, inservice efforts have attempted to bring about change by telling people the correct ways to think and act. This mandate is related to McLaughlin's (1978) belief that many inservice efforts are based on a "deficit" model, which assumes that teachers have inadequate skills and information that can be "corrected" through the "lecture-consultant delivery of truth and knowledge" (p. 79). This deficit model of staff development has been powerfully communicated for many years by a number of diverse role groups. School administrators, university professors, state department officials and legislators use adminstrative regulations, degree and certification requirements and state law to mandate an end to teacher deficits. Ironically, as McLaughlin and March (1978) point out, such mandates are founded upon the dogmatic belief that authorities know and can justify what constitutes good teaching (although twenty-five years of research have not resolved this dilemma) (p. 189). Operating within this deficit assumption also limits our ability

to learn more by giving teachers the opportunity to discuss a possible deficit and ways it might be eliminated.

New Directions for Staff Development

Effective inservice must begin by acknowledging the realities of teachers' attitudes and needs discussed thus far: the demands on teachers today require that they be active learners continuously adapting to changing school and individual student needs; yet the strong influence of former teachers, inadequate training that leads to reliance on personal resources and the social settings in many schools that foster isolation and alienation all encourage a passive resistance to growth and change. As researchers from the Rand study point out, for many teachers,

> . . . passage of time on the job seemed to diminish their capacity to change and to dampen their enthusiasm for innovations and for teaching. This 'calcifying' effect seemed less an intrinsic characteristic of teachers than testimony to the way schools are managed and the way professional development activities are provided for staff. (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978, p. 84)

A number of research studies have begun to document inservice approaches that do respond to the above realities.

Teachers' stages of concern. A logical first step is to discover more about the wide variety of issues and problems faced by the people who will participate in training activities. Loucks and Hall (1977) deal with the problem of matching inservice to teachers' varied needs. They view

changes in teaching practices as a process, not an event, as a highly personal experience that individual teachers move through in different ways and at different rates. They point out that many inservice workshops may be seen as irrelevant because they are not targeted to respond to different levels of concern. In an attempt to design a method that staff developers can use to assess perceptions, motivations, and feelings about an innovation prior to planning the content and format of training activities, they have developed the Concerns-Based Adoption Model. CBAM builds on Frances Fuller's (1966) conception that the concerns of preservice and inservice teachers move along a continuum beginning with concerns about self, moving to concerns about the teaching task, and then to its impact on students. The CBAM model illustrates seven stages in what might be considered a typical progression of thoughts and feelings about a change, moving from non-awareness and indifference all the way to the desire to achieve maximum outcomes and finally to developing even more powerful alternatives. These levels are illustrated by the following chart:

STAGES OF CONCERN ABOUT INNOVATION

6 REFOCUSING: The focus is on exploration of more universal benefits from the innovation, including . . . major changes or replacement within a more powerful alternative. Individual has definite ideas about alternatives to the proposed or existing form . . .

5 COLLABORATION: The focus is on coordination and cooperation with others . . .

4 CONSEQUENCE: Attention focuses on impact of the innovation on student in his/her immediate sphere of influence. The focus is on relevance of the innovation for students, evaluation of student outcomes, including performance and competencies, and changes needed to increase student outcomes.

3 MANAGEMENT: Attention is focused on proceses and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources. Issues related to efficiency, organizing, managing, scheduling and time demands are utmost.

2 PERSONAL: Individual is uncertain about the demands of the innovation, his/her inadequacy to meet those demands, and his/her role with the innovation. This includes analysis of his/her role in relation to the reward structure of the organization, decision making, and consideration of potential conflicts with existing structures or personal commitment. Financial or status implications of the program for self and colleagues may also be reflected.

1 INFORMATIONAL: A general awareness of the innovation and interest in learning more detail about it is indicated. The person seems unworried about himself/herself in relation to the innovation. She/he is interested in substantive aspects of the innovation in a selfless manner such as general characteristics, effects, and requirements for use.

0 AWARENESS: Little concern about or involvement with the innovation is indicated.
(Hall & Loucks, 1978, p. 41)

Use of CBAM and other methods that assess the diversity of teacher concerns suggests a number of key principles that can guide the planning of inservice programs. Hall and Loucks (1978) stress first the importance of acknowledging and accepting the affective or personal side of a change rather than only the "technology" of an innovation. Second, since there are many levels of concern in any change, it is important to remember that change takes time. Therefore, one-shot workshops, decrees and mandated changes do not result in instant results. Long-term follow-up is essential. Third, staff developers cannot concentrate only on "impact" concerns, but must first deal with the personal concerns of school personnel. Finally, because any group of teachers and administrators represents a variety of concerns, the traditional, seemingly cost-effective method of common activities for all participants is not very useful. Creative approaches that "personalize" learning opportunities will bring more success in the end (pp. 52-53).* Hall + Loucks

Collaboration. The need to individualize inservice leads naturally to another equally important element in the planning process: the involvement of participants in designing the format and content of activities. This involvement communicates that inservice is not merely a ritual to be standardized across a district. Teachers interviewed by McLaughlin (1977) felt that if a district viewed staff

development as important, they would provide release time and encourage teacher-involvement in the design of the program. When teachers remain uninvolved, they too perpetuate the "ritual" and continue the same old practices (p. 70). As Bunker (1980) stresses, "Learning is best accomplished when learners are involved and involvement comes about when people have control over decision-making, are listened to, are taken seriously . . ." (p. 78). In support of shared planning, Smith (1975) has found that

> . . . experience with pilot collaboration programs thus far suggests that the extra time and effort given to planning them pays off in a feeling of enthusiasm and a sense of satisfaction that the learning situation has been enhanced. Then, open collaboration becomes a coalition for progress. (p. 37)

Emphasizing collaborative planning leads more naturally to the development of a flexible staff development design reflecting varied perceptions of needs and learning styles and utilizing teacher-administator expertise and originality.

Individualization. Encouraging school personnel to learn new skills requires the same creative approaches we ask teachers to use with their students. According to Leiter and Cooper (1978),

> What we respect about children--variety, individuality--we fail to apply to teachers and what we often tell children--that learning is hard work and requires concentration and application--we do not apply to our expectations for adults. People do learn in different ways. Learning is serious business and more provision

> must be made in teacher-learning situations for reading, reflection, discussion, profound and thorough presentations of ideas and strategies and for a flexible, positively expectant learning environment. (pp. 121-122)

Lawrence's (1974) comprehensive review of ninety-seven studies on inservice reveals that "Inservice educational programs that have differentiated training experiences for different teachers" (p. 14) that allow teachers to "choose goals and activities for themselves" and that emphasize "self-initiated and self-directed training activities" (p. 15) have greater success in accomplishing program goals. Bunker (1980) in writing about "Helping Staff Development Groups to Self-Direct" emphasizes that "Participants will benefit from self-initiated, self-directed learning. People are their own instruments for growth. A major aim of staff development is to help others become more self-directed" (p. 12). The use of individualized programs responds to the problem Mann (1975) identifies that:

> . . . virtually every teacher and every administrator believes that their situation is literally unique and thus feel themselves justified in ignoring any advice or reforms not consciously tailored to their particular situation. (p. 22)

Peer instruction. In the process of matching activites to a specific situation, programs have proved to be more successful if they draw on the expertise of local people who have direct experience with school problems. Orrange and VanRyn (1975) stress that:

> Peer instruction and sharing are gaining respectability as highly effective vehicles for improving classroom teacher performance. No longer can individuals who are far removed from day to day contact with elementary and secondary schools dictate what is relevant and necessary for survival. (p. 49)

Rand researchers also confirm that ". . . in terms of knowledge about the practice of teaching, teachers often represent the best clinical expertise available" (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978, p. 87).

Sharing and collaboration with colleagues helps to eliminate the teacher-isolation so prevalent in many schools. School districts that have turned from district-wide workshops or lectures to the formation of small-group task forces of four to eight people who choose to work together on a specific problem help to create a "critical mass" of teachers and administrators in the same school who can support each other and therefore establish a norm for change day-to-day within their school. Thus, Lawrence (1974) has found that "programs in which teachers share and provide mutual assistance to each other are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs in which each teacher does separate work" (p. 15)

School site training. Goodlad (1975) emphasizes the importance of conducting staff development programs at the single school level. He explains

> . . . that the single school falls nicely between the depersonalized, complex, amorphous school system and the somewhat intimidated, impotent, individual teacher. The school house is a physical entity. . . . It is occupied by real people--not just 'they'--who can be seen and talked with, face to face; it has an identity characterized by roles and people who occupy them, activities, ways of behaving, perceptions, and even elements of a special language. It satisfies at least some of the components of a culture, shaped in part by those who occupy it, and, to a degree, shaping them. (p. 173)

Lawrence (1974) agrees that staff development programs that are "school-based" (p. 9) and "linked to a general effort of the school" and its staff are far more successful than "single shot programs that are not a part of the general staff development plan" (p. 15). McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) go further in stressing individualization within a single school because

> District-wide--or even school-wide--inservice education activities that only elaborate on present practice usually are seen as a waste of time by experienced staff. . . . After several years in the classroom, teachers want to explore new areas and take more responsibility for their professional growth. (pp. 84-85)

If schools do not explicitly address the professional development needs of their tenured staff who may have moved beyond the need for informative workshops, McLaughlin and Marsh conclude, "it is not entirely surprising that experienced teachers sometimes feel there is little challenge left for them and 'turn off' from teaching" (p. 85).

Curriculum creation. Inservice programs that allow individuals to work according to their level of concern while

focusing on ongoing improvement in the schools emphasize the creation of curricula which teachers can use with their students. Smith (1975) maintains that teachers more consistently continue the work they have begun in inservice training sessions when their activities have related to or generated curriculum development:

> Unless the program is changed through an evolving process of curriculum development, the isolated innovation is likely to be dropped from the teacher's repertoire over time as extraneous curriculum demands take hold. (p. 37)

The process of curriculum creation enables teachers to continue to grow in an active way (constructing and generating materials, ideas and behavior) and thus results in increased personal investment and commitment. Mann (1975) discovered that "locally developed curriculum can counteract insularity of teachers, who usually believe that no one can possibly know anything about their situations" (p. III-31). Berman (1975) equates curriculum production with the exercise of "reinventing the wheel" which "can provide an important opportunity for staff to work through and understand project precepts and to develop a sense of 'ownership' in project methods and goals" (p. 19).

All of the above inservice strategies, because they emphasize teacher initiative in the planning, developing and implementing of change, can result in what Rand reseachers refer to as "mutual adaptation," the process by which

teachers adapt an innovation to the realities of their own classrooms, and, in turn, are changed by it (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978, pp. 16-17).

Ongoing support. Mutual adaptation, like all learning and growing, is a continuous developmental process which is best facilitated by ongoing, on-site support that can be provided by the principal, colleagues in the school, and resource personnel. Rand researchers note that following staff training activities (workshops, courses, etc.), staff support activities provide a way in which "skill specific training can be individualized for project teachers in terms of timing and content modification" especially since "staff often cannot perceive what they need to know until the need arises" (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978, p. 78). However, the quality of "advisory" support is a crucial issue in providing constructive rather than destructive aid. Effective consultants must be able to provide "concrete practical advice to project teachers--showing them how to adapt project materials to their own situation" and "how to solve problems for themselves" (p. 78). If resource people do not foster teacher independence, their assistance can have negative effects by unintentionally preventing teachers from learning to use strategies by themselves.

Manolakes (1977) describes a variety of valuable functions for an advisor. First he or she can serve as a "seed

planter and extender," developing a dialogue between two professionals, offering ideas to be accepted or rejected, and, in general, extending the thinking of teachers about how to improve their work. Second, advisors can function as "technical helpers," working alongside teachers, demonstrating techniques, to help in the implementation of teacher-plans (pp. 105-106). Third, advisors can be "expediters" who work with principals to get the job done when policies and procedures represent frustrating blocks. Advisors may help to obtain materials more quickly or get permission to bend a policy before teachers return to a "safer" method. Fourth, advisors can be "informants and communication stimulators," helping teachers and principals to know what other colleagues are doing and establishing communication networks to extend teachers' "insulated professional lives" (Manolakes, 1977, pp. 107-108). Thomas (1979) adds that advisors can help teachers "to articulate their values and goals and make a lifetime habit of thoughtful reflection upon their work" and can extend "the services of a teacher's center to school buildings" (p. 7). In all of these roles, successful advisors attempt to foster professional independence in teachers so that eventually they will become advisors for each other.

Another important staff-support activity is developed through frequent staff meetings that focus not on reporting

administrative details but rather on sharing problems and describing progress. These meetings create a forum in which teachers and the principal can learn from each other's experiences. Such meetings meet the affective needs of people facing complex change and help to constantly clarify goals and operations as well as the implications of new school strategies. Again, this support activity continues the "mutual adaptation" and "reinvention of the wheel" that help teachers and administrators understand and adjust change to local needs. In so doing, they develop real ownership of change and growth and therefore establish its true institutionalization.

Conclusion

Underlying all of the educational research findings about successful staff development activities is an emphasis on using a most under-utilized educational resource: teachers' and principals' experienced-based perceptions of their needs and instructional problems as well as their collective talents in devising ways to solve them. Unleashing these talents requires a radical movement away from the deficit information-delivery series of "single-shot" training experiences for large groups that characterizes so many of our traditional staff development models. It continues to be important to "

> Design approaches to inservice education which are more consonant with the purposes of staff renewal, that is, to help teachers and administrators articulate goals, uncover real problems to solve, find resources in their own ranks, learn new interactions among one another and with children, and to grow in the ability to be self-sustaining and less dependent on outside help for growth (Bunker, 1977, p. 31).

Any lasting change in schools is a developmental process that begins with identifying what innovations make sense, how they can be adapted to each unique environment and what resources and support should be provided to develop a true understanding of new concepts and mastery of new skills. It continues by providing appropriate and flexible on site support that utilizes local resources during implementation and by finding ways that school personnel can independently retain and continue improvements and change.

CHAPTER III

PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Introduction

A significant challenge faced by staff developers today involves the actual application of research findings about successful practices to the complex problems of change in diverse local settings. Drawing on the theories about more effective strategies for staff training and support culled from current research presented in Chapter II, this chapter will respond to Research Question One, "How can current research findings about staff development activities that enhance professional growth be applied to a local staff development program?" This description of a local program emphasizes the context and situational parameters of a single school within a particular school system and the community that this school serves.

For purposes of replication or adaptation, it is important to understand the particulars of the setting as well as the specific problems and needs to be addressed. Therefore, this chapter presents a description of (1) the larger environment--Centre City and the Centre City Public schools, (2) the specific context--City High School and City Community High School (their facilities, student body and

educational personnel), (3) the elements of change faced by educational personnel (new school resources, new programs, new professional roles) and (4) the staff development program (stages in collaborative planning and implementation of activities supporting change).

The Larger Context (Centre City)

Centre City (population 170,000) is one of the major cities in this northeastern state. It is an industrial and commercial center which has approximately seven hundred diversified manufacturing establishments as well as a large cross section of distribution and service businesses. Its largest number of employees (forty-five percent of whom are women) are in the wholesale and retail trade, service industries and manufacturing.

Located in Centre City are eight four-year degree-granting colleges and four junior colleges as well as a number of other well-known educational and cultural institutions. Over one hundred churches, synagogues and temples provide places of worship for about twenty-five religious groups.

Centre City's population is racially and socioeconomically diverse. The predominating ethnic groups, according to the 1970 Census, are French-Canadian, Irish, Italian,

Swedish, Polish and English. Three percent of the city's population is Black and eight percent is Hispanic.

During the 1960-1970 decade, the population of Centre City decreased by approximately 10,000 or 5.8 percent. Although records show an excess of 10,000 births over deaths, there was a net out-migration of 20,000. This pattern has continued in the next decade.

Centre City Public Schools. The Centre City Public Schools consist of four high schools, four junior high schools, two middle schools and forty-eight elementary schools, many of which are small neighborhood schools serving less than two hundred students. Since the population of Centre City is declining, a number of elementary schools have been closed since 1970. Others have been recommended by an outside consultant for closing. Approximately 1,800 educators serve the student population of 24,000, but each year has witnessed a decline in school enrollments and a subsequent decrease in the teaching and administrative staff, thus far from retirements, elimination of permanent substitute positions and natural attrition.

Declining enrollments are a major concern for teachers in the Centre City Public Schools since they now have far fewer opportunities to transfer to more desirable teaching positions when vacancies occur. Historically, positions in the senior high schools have been filled by those who have

taught for a number of years in the junior high schools and have earned a master's degree. In addition, the loss of positions at all levels is a constant source of concern for teachers with fewer years of seniority. Some senior high teachers have been compelled to return to junior high schools because of declining enrollments. A very limited number of new teachers are hired each year, primarily in the areas of special education and bilingual education. Therefore, each year the teaching staff at the Centre City Schools is increasingly characterized by older, experienced teachers who have remained for many years in the same school and the same school system.

Although the number of students, teachers and even school buidings has been declining during this decade, the inflation of fuel and instructional material costs as well as professional salaries has increased the cost of education. Concern over sharply rising expenses has led the School Committee to concentrate on severe budget cuts which force school personnel, given current calls for "accountability" and emphasis on basic skills, to try to do more and more with less funding and fewer resources. As a result, "teacher burnout" and "job stress" are strong concerns of faculty and administration at Centre City Public Schools.

The Specific Contexts

City High School. City High School is one of four high schools in Centre City. It is a seventy-five-year-old, three-story building located in the second poorest area of the city. Each day the school's 1,000 students move from one self- contained classroom to another according to a traditional schedule of seven forty-two--minute periods. In general, classrooms are poorly equipped for scientific experiments, home economics and industrial arts activities as well as any other learning activity that requires more than a room with desks and chairs.

The school has an auditorium with a protruding platform that serves as a stage. Its classroom-sized library, because of limited space, stores most of its library books in lockers which line the hallway outside the library. A small closet on the third floor is used to store a limited supply of instructional media (projectors, tape recorders, record players) which teachers sign up to borrow. An annex adjacent to the main building, built fifty-five years ago, contains a gymnasium and locker rooms on the first and second floors and additional classrooms on the third floor. No athletic fields exist on the school grounds. Team practice after school takes place at an athletic field located approximately one mile from the school site.

Except for two small rooms which serve as separate "lounges" for male and female teachers, no other place in the school existed for informal faculty exchanges. In response to this need, a former coal bin, located in the sub-basement of the school, was converted into a Teacher Resource Room. This was designed by school personnel and staff members of a three-year federally-funded teacher-training project who worked with faculty to prepare for the projected move to the new City Community High School. The Teacher Resource Room was divided into areas that could accommodate large and small group sessions as well as private spaces for independent work. The room was used for meetings and staff development programs held during and after school to support teachers in their planning activities.

City Community High School. City Community High School, the first community school at the secondary level in the city, is a fourteen million dollar, three-story structure developed on a forty-three acre site of land. It is located in the less-populated and country-like southwest area of the city. The new school is designed to serve 1,500 students who will attend classes scheduled according to a "differentiated semi-rotating" schedule. Their instructional periods will range from forty-two to sixty-five minutes in length. Classes will be held in different time blocks on A, B, C, and D days. One period is eliminated each day. Thus, an

individual class will meet four times a week at varying times of the day and for varying periods of time.

Instructional areas at City Community High School, a flexible space building, are large department "pods" encompassing as many as ten separate "learning stations" for separate classes. Rather than walls, hanging dividers as well as movable floor dividers provide extensive flexibility in area definition as well as in mode of instruction.

The new high school contains a huge library media center on two levels which can store and display massive amounts of reference materials and which can accommodate large number of students working individually or in groups. Adjoining the center is a television studio which enables students and faculty to produce programs and broadcast them throughout the school. In addition, the school has a digital computer with eight terminals that can be used for many instructional purposes.

A special education wing of the building is designed to serve all of the city's secondary special needs students. The wing contains resource rooms, observation room, occupational and pre-vocational training workshops, speech and deaf therapy rooms and a food service area.

Physical education facilities are extensive. They include a large gymnasium and olympic-sized swimming pool within the building, an outdoor quarter-mile track, five

tennis courts, football, baseball, field hockey and soccer fields, as well as separate practice areas for these sports.

Three kitchen-equipped male-female faculty lounges are located on the first, second and third floors of the building. A meeting room for the community is also provided.

Student populations at City High School and City Community High School. Approximately ninety percent of the one thousand City High School students are Caucasians representing a broad diversity of ethnic backgrounds. Ten percent are Black and Hispanic. The school is eligible for Title I projects since eighteen percent of the students are from low-income families and ten percent are from families receiving Aid to Dependent Children. A large percentage of the City High student population resides in census tract 13, which is the second poorest area of Centre City.

Students entering grade 9 at City High School number 350; however, the graduating class in the past few years has consisted of only 183 (thirty-nine percent of whom go on to four-year or two-year colleges). Faculty identify freshmen students as the group which presents them with the most difficulty in terms of "discipline" and "instructional achievement." City High School guidance counselors point out that the greatest student attrition occurs during their junior year when students reach the age of sixteen and are no longer legally bound to attend school. These students who

are "biding their time" may account for the high absentee and tardy rates cited by City High School administrators. On a typical day, sixteen percent of the students are absent and another ten percent must be dealt with for tardiness to school and/or unauthorized absence from some of their classes.

The student population of City Community High School will consist of 1,500 students, 1,000 of the old City High School student population and 500 additional students drawn from an extended attendance area encompassing the poorest neighborhood in the city and some middle class neighborhoods. Given the new facilities and programs to be offered at the new community high school, the student population will include the city's secondary bilingual students who will attend bilingual and regular classes according to their language facility and instructional needs, and 120 special needs students (formerly characterized as "trainable mentally retarded" and "educable mentally retarded"). While fifty of the special needs students will be involved in a total services program with special education teachers, seventy students will participate in a resource program during which they spend a portion of the school day in regular classes; a few special needs students will be fully integrated into regular classes and monitored by special education teachers. Special needs students in regular classes

will have learning disabilities related to difficulty with auditory and visual learning, reading comprehension and reporting back in written form.

Professional personnel at City High School and City Community High School. The school personnel at City High School consists of sixty-seven teachers and four guidance counselors. The ratio of males to females is two to one. The all-male administration consists of three assistant principals and one principal. With the exception of one Black and two Hispanic teachers, all other staff members are Caucasian. The average age of school personnel is forty-four years and seventy percent of the staff have earned masters degrees or certificates of advanced graduate study. Two faculty members have Ed.D. degrees. The majority of degrees were earned from a local college and university situated in Centre City.

Although faculty had no guarantee that they would be selected as part of the staff of the new City Community High School, most staff members participated in varying degrees in activities which focused on developing new teaching roles and new curricula to be used at the new school. Most of these preparational activities were developed and carried out by the staff of a federally-funded teacher-training program in the City High School Teacher Resource Room. Staff development activities consisted of courses and independent

study projects facilitated on-site by faculty at a university participating in the federal program. As a result, at the conclusion of the three-year federal program, two teachers had earned masters degrees and seventeen teachers received certificates of advanced graduate study. In addition, a number of non-credit staff development activities took place on-site at City High School. These included: support group projects in which groups of faculty worked together to address identified school problems; lectures and demonstrations offered by consultants and school resource people; media presentations requested by teachers and shown in the Resource Room; and instructional material-creation and curriculum development by teachers who used Resource Room equipment and supplies. Approximately forty-five percent of the City High School faculty participated in at least three of the above activites on an active, ongoing basis. As a result, approximately thirty faculty members at City High School had experienced a substantial amount of preparation for their potential roles in the new school.

The ninety-eight teachers and six guidance counselors who comprised the staff of the new City Community High School consisted of fifty-eight former City High School faculty and forty-six faculty members selected from all of the other secondary schools in the city. The new faculty is sixty percent male and forty percent female. Five teachers

are Hispanic and one is Black. All others are Caucasian. The City High School principal and assistant principals who served at City High School during its last year were all transferred to City Community High School. Educational personnel at the new school evidenced a variety of teaching backgrounds and a spectrum of former preparation for teaching at the new school. Ninety percent of the staff have earned masters or CAGS degrees. Two members had Ed.D. degrees.

Approximately thirty percent of the new staff were former City High School teachers who had participated extensively in Resource Room staff development activities. The other seventy percent had had little or no direct preparation for teaching in the new school, although applicants for City Community High School had been given the opportunity to join City High School faculty in one curriculum development planning course offered by the federally-funded inservice team the semester prior to the move to the new school. Some applicants who participated in this planning course were selected; some were not. As a result of all the above factors, the new staff at City Community High School comprised a very diverse group representing a variety of prior experiences and training as well as a broad spectrum of subject area interests and training needs.

Major Elements of Change

Faculty selected to teach at the new City Community High School were indeed faced with the challenge of complex changes: changes in environment, in instructional programs, student needs and new professional roles.

One obvious challenge was represented by their impressive and somewhat overwhelmingly new facilities and resources. While many had long faced the problem of ill-equipped and shabbily furnished self-contained classrooms, none had had any direct experience with teaching in flexible-space department pods in full view of other colleagues, many of whom were total strangers. While most were accustomed to a lack of curricular materials or instructional equipment, the ready availability of ample supplies of new materials and media ordered by system-wide subject matter coordinators and directors was a unique experience. A great deal of teacher time and effort would be needed to learn about and adapt materials to their own teaching styles.

All faculty members who came from other senior and junior high schools in Centre City were accustomed to teaching their classes according to a predictable and stable schedule of seven or eight uniform "periods" held at the same time each day. At City Community High School, the introduction of a "differentiated semi-rotating" schedule of

classes which would meet four times each week for varying amounts of time (forty-two to sixty-five minutes) and at different times of the school day would require some creative changes in class activities and learning modes.

Meeting the needs of a student population that was new to everyone and very diverse, comprised of low and middle income students from different cultures as well as a significant number of bilingual and special needs students, reflected a repertoire of new teaching strategies. The staff was also aware of the need to meet the affective needs of students in this 1,500-pupil school, which was larger than any of the other Centre City high schools. A new role for each faculty member (developed by the administration) was that of teacher/advisor to a heterogeneous group of approximately fifteen students, grades 9-12. Teacher and students were scheduled to meet each day during a "communication period" and at other available times to create a "support group" in this large and complex educational structure. The teacher, working with a guidance counselor, would be functioning as an advocate for these fifteen students, helping with instructional and behavioral or personal problems identified by the students themselves or by their subject matter teachers.

In addition, the role of faculty members at City Community High School, the first community high school in

Centre City, included working more extensively with parents and community members. The new school had been designed as a facility which could provide members of the surrounding neighborhoods with many new opportunities for educational enrichment during and after school. On a space-available basis, parents and residents could attend classes offered during the school day and could join with educational personnel in developing extra-curricular community programs for students and adults that respond to identified needs and interests. While parent participation in Centre City's high schools varies at each site, the majority of teachers had had limited experience in working with adults in their classes and in collaborating with community members in addressing school concerns.

Given the complex mixture of new challenges that City Community High School represented to the new staff, all acknowledged that there was a great deal to prepare for, and predictably in this concrete situation, little time to do so. The majority of the new faculty had been selected by February 1978. City Community High School had been slated to open in September 1978.

Planning for Change

Initiative for preparation of the new faculty began in March at the Centre City Public Schools central office. The

Director of Staff Development met with the future principal and assistant principals of City Community High School to discuss what might be done. They decided that faculty should be involved in planning whatever preparational activities would take place and the writer, employed at that time by the Office of Staff Development, was asked to work with administrators and staff to design a program which would facilitate the smooth opening and first year at City Community High School.

The planning process (April-July 1978). The planning process developed for preparational activities was conceptually based upon a number of principles emphasized in current research findings about successful staff development practices. These principles will be cited as rationales for the steps taken in the planning and implementation of the staff development program to be studied.

First of all, the writer, who functioned as the program coordinator, recognized the need stressed by Loucks and Hall (1978) to acknowledge the wide variety of issues and problems faced by any administration and staff of a particular school and therefore the importance, as cited by McLaughlin (1977), of involving participants representing different concerns in designing the format and content of any staff development program. Fortunately, given the focus of this program, preparation for a particular new school,

activities were in consonance with Goodlad's (1975) belief that successful activities should be school-based and linked to a general effort of the school.

However, the attempt to link theory to practice must also acknowledge situational limitations within a local context which require some compromising of the ideal. The amount of time and effort expended in a planning process seems to increase in proportion to the number of people who are drawn together to make and carry out plans. Given unlimited time, all staff members can be extensively involved. However, the desire to enable as many of the future City Community High School staff as possible to develop ownership of staff development activities by direct participation in making plans was tempered by the recognition of time and energy limitations within this local context. Following final selection of the new City Community High School staff and the administrative decision to conduct a summer staff development program, approximately three months of the Spring semester (April, May and June) remained to plan. During this time, the approximately one hundred new faculty members were situated not at the new site, but at ten different schools in Centre City. In addition, due to budget restrictions, no release time for planning could be provided.

Developing a planning committee. Taking these factors into consideration, the Director of Staff development and City

Community High School administration decided to ask newly-appointed department heads and, in cases where no department heads existed, liaison teachers for each department, to become members of what came to be called the Teachers Planning Committee. Members of this committee were asked to collectively design and help to implement activities which would assist the entire staff to prepare for the first school year.

The Planning Committee also included a City Community High School assistant principal and a staff member from the Office of Staff Development, the writer, who became the program coordinator. Planning Committee members became responsible for setting up a process of ongoing communication with members of each department, with City Community High School administrators and with central office staff in order to maintain broad-based communication and feedback as plans evolved.

Identifying a site for planning activities. Many of the newly-named department heads and liaison teachers were City High School staff members who were familiar with one another. This group was also well-acquainted with the Teacher Resource Room at City High which had come to be viewed as a comfortable environment for meetings and presentations. The "lounge area" of the Resource Room was therefore chosen as the after-school planning site. This environment, furnished

with lounge chairs and couches placed in a circular arrangement next to wall-length bulletin boards for easy display of issues raised, helped to encourage free exchange of ideas, as did coffee and donuts served to raise energy levels after a long day of teaching.

First steps: Generating questions. The first meeting was held to generate questions about the group's goals and ways to achieve them. Participants were anxious to discuss issues and problems as well as suggestions for solving them. Their initial exploratory questions were:

- How can staff get to know each other and their new school?
- Are summer planning meetings necessary or desirable?
- When and where should these meetings take place?

Committee members agreed during this meeting that their colleagues had already widely expressed a pressing need to find out more about City Community High School. Thus far, new faculty had toured the yet-uncompleted facilities and had attended a one-hour informational meeting with administrators who discussed, in general, the need to be flexible and adaptive and, more specifically, the new schedule to be implemented, and the new roles of teacher/advisor and school/community liaison with parents and residents that teachers would be asked to play. Committee members were unanimous in their agreement that the entire staff needed to come together for some extended period of time in the new

school site to get to know each other and to become familiar with the overall school organization and the specific roles within it. It was also agreed that these meetings must take place during the summer (since the school building would not be ready for occupancy until that time) and that a period of at least two weeks would be a realistic amount of time to work together. The committee agreed that these meetings should be voluntary and that staff members should be paid for attending these summer sessions (according to the rate traditionally paid to teachers engaged in professional activities during the summer).

At this point, committee members decided that they would return to the colleagues they represented to discuss general points of agreement reached at this meeting (the need for a summer meeting at the new school, possibly two weeks in duration, which faculty would be invited to attend) and to get answers to specific questions about such a meeting:

- How should days be scheduled?
- What concerns need to be addressed?
- What activities would be most useful?

Clarifying staff needs and suggestions. As a result of separate meetings between each committee members and his or her constituency, members returned to the second planning meeting laden with lists of issues to be addressed in

preparation for the new school. These extensive data from administration and thirteen departments served to concretely document to the planning group the complexity of the task ahead--planning meaningful activities that could, in the time available, respond to individual, department, whole faculty and administrative concerns all within one summer program. However, as members poured over each other's ideas, they were encouraged by an obvious commonality of suggestions they had recorded. In order to visually compare feedback each had received, this meeting was spent in developing an elaborate chart listing topics that each group believed should be covered at a summer meeting. Suggestions from one group sparked ideas in another; some lists were more extensive and seemed to members to be more "complete." Therefore, the meeting ended when some members expressed the desire to return to their departments to get further clarification about their "list." In the meantime, a subcommittee of three members volunteered to further study the newly created chart of suggestions to identify tentative umbrella "categories" under which these diverse concerns could be placed.

Categorizing major areas of concern. The next meeting began with the addition of topics to the master chart and then with a presentation of the subcommittee which had been able to delineate five general areas of concern that seemed to

cover the charted lists. After extensive discussion and some revision, members agreed that five general categories did reflect their major concerns. The group then together phrased questions under each category that gave it a greater focus and clarity.

The areas of concern and questions generated from this sharing were:

(1) Flexible Space Design: How can we give individuals and groups the opportunity to organize their furniture, equipment and materials in their department pods for maximum instructional effectiveness?

(2) Instructional Concerns: How can we help participants to determine and develop new and existing curricula and new teaching strategies that would best meet the needs of students and teachers in their new environment?

(3) Department Business: How can we provide department heads and department members with the opportunity to distribute teaching materials and staff assignments and to deal with the innumerable administrative details affecting the efficient functioning of their group?

(4) New Roles: How can we help educational personnel prepare themselves for their new roles of teacher/advisor and community educator given special emphasis in the new school?

(5) School Management Concerns: How can we enable administrators to work with the entire faculty to develop procedures for opening day, to establish school regulations, to clarify teacher duties and to inform everyone concerned about new school features and facilities?

Developing a Responsive Staff Development Program

Having answered, in general terms, the question of "What concerns are most important?", planning committee members needed next to address the issue of "How can concerns be met?" This question had to be answered within the agreed-upon time allotment established for summer staff activities. Broad-based feedback from potential participants had led to the decision to set aside two weeks (Monday-Friday) in August for a staff development program. The ten days of the program would begin at 8 a.m. and continue until 1 p.m. Due to possible high temperatures and discomfort during those summer days, the majority of people polled preferred a morning schedule to a longer day which would have included a luncheon break. It was also decided that soft drinks, coffee and refreshments would be provided each day (8:45-9:00 a.m.).

Given this general schedule, a subcommittee was formed to attempt to design a variety of activities reflecting

different concerns and needs. This subcommittee of three members, including the writer (program coordinator), was asked to take into account a number of considerations defined by the planning group. Planning members gave first priority to setting aside a substantial amount of time for "department work" during which individual departments could create their own agendas and individuals within a department could work in teams or independently. As a second priority, administrators expressed a real need for adequate opportunities to meet with the entire faculty and teachers agreed that this was important. Finally, the group together agreed that some time should be set aside to meet with resource people who could present a variety of workshops on the use of flexible space, new curricula, and school equipment and many other topics requested by individuals and groups. The group realized that all needs for information and skill-development could not be met in a two-week period and therefore most workshops could only provide participants with a brief introduction to certain topics. However, they decided that even this brief opportunity would be useful and that training could be continued during the school year.

At this point in the planning process, some members of the planning committee expressed dual feelings about their roles in developing a program: satisfaction that they had been able to identify broad-based concerns and yet

frustration about what little planning time remained during the school year to involve as many personnel as possible in actually designing concrete activities. Committee members therefore stressed that the program design should be as flexible as possible to allow teachers to choose goals and activities for themsevles.

Establishing the program design. The general program design developed by the subcommittee for planning activities was based upon the above requests made by the planning committee as well as a number of general principles derived from current research findings about effective staff development. In designing an initial program, the subcommittee acknowledged the need to allow for differentiated training activities for different staff members, for self-initiated and self-directed activities for individuals (Lawrence, 1974) and for peer-instruction and sharing (Orrange and Van Ryn, 1975). The subcommittee was also highly cognizant of the importance of administrator involvement in training activities since, as Berman and McLaughlin (1978) stress, principals are the "gatekeepers of change" whose support and involvement give key messages about the worth and legitimacy of teacher efforts.

Basing their plans upon the above principles and using the chart of suggestions from all potential participants and the five general areas of concern identified by the Planning

Committee, the Subcommittee for Activities decided that the following types of activities would provide participants with both structure and flexibility:

Faculty briefing sessions. Large group meetings of the entire City Community High School staff and administrators which would (1) allow for the exchange of information about activities for opening day, new school facilities and features, general school rules and regulations, management procedures and various faculty duties and would (2) provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and expression of concerns among faculty members and administrators.

Department work sessions. Blocks of time set aside for (1) meetings among colleagues in a particular department facilitated by department heads or another department leader and focusing on pre-arranged agenda items and (2) time for individual department members to collaborate in teams or work independently on curricular and instructional concerns.

General feedback sessions. Faculty meetings during which selected City Community High School staff members make brief presentations that share creative ideas they have developed in response to some whole-school concern such as pod design, traffic flow patterns, plans for student orientation or teacher collaboration.

Workshops. Small group training sessions facilitated by Centre City Public Schools resource people or an

identified consultant who would focus (in the time available) on developing skills or providing information requested by participants.

General sessions. Large group presentations from local officials (Mayor, Superintendent, School Committee members) and community agency representatives or consultants.

Other activities. As defined by the Planning Committee (bus tour, family picnic, etc.).

The above categories of activities, because they gave participants great flexibility in responding to diverse concerns, were accepted as a general outline by the Planning Committee. However, how sessions would be scheduled and how activities would be carried out were yet unanswered questions.

Scheduling program activities. Once basic categories of activities were conceptualized, the Planning Committee's next task involved time allotments. Continuous feedback from participants indicated that they gave highest priority to activities that allowed them to collaborate within or among departments. Therefore, the Planning Committee decided that at least 50 percent of the staff development program time should be set aside for department agenda (work sessions). Administrators indicated that 20 percent of the program time was sufficient for administrative meetings with

faculty. It was also agreed that varying amounts of time (10-20 percent of program time) should be devoted to separate workshops (a few, reflecting common concerns, should be offered on a rotating basis to all departments and others that were more specialized should be designed for single departments or small groups). Furthermore, the Planning Committee agreed to add other suggested activities to the overall program: tours of the school and a bus tour of the community (suggested by the Principal), a picnic for faculty and their families (proposed by a faculty member as a way to build new relationships among colleagues) and official opening and closing sessions requested by the central administrative staff through the Office of Staff Development.

Scheduling of all these sessions into a comprehensive two-week program appeared to be herculean task. Everyone reached prompt agreement about where in the schedule the "opening" and "closing" sessions would appear! The rest of the design required far more time. Decisions regarding the scheduling of other sessions lacked clarity among this large planning group. Therefore, we decided to first develop certain principles to which the group could collectively agree. Next, given severe time constraints, the Activities Subcommittee volunteered to develop a program design incorporating the agreed-upon principles. The guidelines developed for their work were:

(1) A variety of activities should be scheduled each day

(2) The chart of concerns developed by Planning Committee members should be used to assign specific topics to each time block

(3) Activities during the first week should first respond to high-priority basic concerns (school facilities, space design, operating procedures)

(4) When participants had answered basic questions and felt more familiar with their environment, activities should focus on more specialized topics and workshops during the second week

Utilizing these guidelines, a program design was developed by the Subcommittee and, after extensive discussion and some revision, was approved by the Planning Committee members. It was then duplicated and sent to all administrators and teachers for their review, revision and/or subsequent approval. One substantial change in the original program design involved the elimination of a "Public Relations Day" during which community members would be invited to tour the school, meet with teachers and attend a special program describing school programs and opportunities for community education. Planning Committee members discovered that a number of school facilities would not be completed according to schedule. Therefore, plans for an Open House for the community were postponed until after the school opened in

the Fall. Planners were disappointed by this unavoidable problem because such a community activity would have enabled personnel to learn more about community members and to plan programs to meet their needs.

The agreed upon program design was organized in the following way:

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM DESIGN

Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5
Opening Ceremonies and Overview of Program (1-1/2 hours)	Faculty Briefing: "School Organization" (1 hour)	General Session: Student Orientation and Teacher Coordination in Flexible Space (1 hour)		Department Work Session: "Department Agenda" (2 hours)
Faculty Briefing Session: "School Design and Traffic Flow" (1/2 hour)	General Session: Guidelines for Space Design, Noise Control and Traffic Flow" (1 hour)	Department Work Session: Plans for Student Orientation and Teacher Cooperation" (2 hours)	Department Work Session: "Organizing Materials and Equipment: - Inventory - Storage - Distribution" (4 hours)	
Tour of School (1-1/2 hours)	Department Work Session: "Pod Design" (3 hours)	General Feedback Session: "Sharing Ideas Developed from Work Session" (1 hour)		General Session: "School/Community Cooperation Panel" (2 hours)
Department Work Session: Planning and Collaboration" (1-1/2 hours)		Faculty Briefing: "Questions and Answers" (1 hour)	Faculty Briefing: School Organization and Community Participation" (1 hour)	Bus Tour of Community (1-1/2 hours)

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM DESIGN

Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5
Opening Ceremonies and Overview of Program (1-1/2 hours)	Faculty Briefing: "School Organization" (1 hour)	General Session: Student Orientation and Teacher Coordination in Flexible Space (1 hour)	Department Work Session: "Organizing Materials and Equipment: - Inventory - Storage - Distribution" (4 hours)	Department Work Session: "Department Agenda" (2 hours)
Faculty Briefing Session: "School Design and Traffic Flow" (1/2 hour)	General Session: Guidelines for Space Design, Noise Control and Traffic Flow" (1 hour)	Department Work Session: Plans for Student Orientation and Teacher Cooperation" (2 hours)		
Tour of School (1-1/2 hours)	Department Work Session: "Pod Design" (3 hours)	General Feedback Session: "Sharing Ideas Developed from Work Session" (1 hour)	Faculty Briefing: School Organization and Community Participation" (1 hour)	General Session: "School/Community Cooperation Panel" (2 hours)
Department Work Session: Planning and Collaboration" (1-1/2 hours)		Faculty Briefing: "Questions and Answers" (1 hour)		Bus Tour of Community (1-1/2 hours)

Reaction to the program design received from the program participants was overwhelmingly favorable. Feedback received by Planning Committee members indicated that teachers and administrators believed that their concerns and suggestions were reflected in the staff development program and that the various activities provided ample opportunities to pursue individual goals in preparing for the new school.

Defining responsibilities for program design and implementation. The Planning Committee reached this stage in program design in mid-June. It was the consensus of the group that further work would most effectively be done by small groups whose responsibilities involved organizing specific sessions. The writer (program coordinator) assumed the role of liaison between those responsible for planning and implementing diverse staff development activities scheduled for each day. Responsibilities for individual activities were defined as follows:

Activity	Planners	Defined Tasks
Faculty Briefing Sessions	Principals and Assistant Principals	Set agenda, Prepare materials Give presentations
Tour of School	Assistant Principals	Design tour Divide groups Conduct tour
Department Work Sessions	Department Heads or Liaison Teachers (Department Leaders)	Involve department members in setting agenda Facilitate meetings Encourage and support individual and team work projects
General Sessions	Program Coordinator and Faculty Volunteers	Use participant feedback to design session Identify appropriate resource people and consultants Organize and facilitate sessions
Workshops	Program Coordinator and Department Heads or Liaison Teachers and School System Subject Area Coordinators	Identify potential participants Define workshop focus using participant feedback Choose local resource people or consultants Help to develop appropriate materials
Bus Tour of Community	Principals and Assistant Principals	Design and organize tour Divide groups Provide guided commentary
Opening and Closing Ceremonies	Principal and Director of Staff Development	Invite speakers Introduce speakers

Implementing the staff development program. Small groups of individuals responsible for specific staff development activities in the two-week program met separately in July to further define and organize their sessions. The complete program (shown in Appendix C) represents their final product. The following is a description of how the sessions were conceived and developed.

Faculty briefing sessions. The Principal and three Assistant Principals of City Community High School worked in the new school building during July to identify the content of the various themes characterizing their faculty briefing sessions and to determine the person(s) responsible for making presentations in each. Faculty briefing sessions began with general concerns and became more specific in each session held during the two weeks as faculty members became more familiar with their new environment. One separate session was designed solely for expression of faculty concerns and questions, but all briefing sessions allowed time for open discussion. The final briefing session at City Community High School dealt with information about Opening Day at City Community High School. As they planned their sessions, administrators agreed to allow time during the first and last meetings for faculty to answer pre- and post questionnaires designed to measure changes in faculty attitudes toward new tasks before and after the staff

development program and to elicit faculty comments about program activities.

Tour of the school. Each of the three assistant principals was assigned an office located on one of the three levels of the new school building. Their responsibilities during the school year were divided according to the activities that took place on this building level and the departments located on each level. Therefore, when planning the 1-1/2 hour school tour, each assistant principal took responsibility for guiding groups of faculty through the facilities on his level. Faculty were divided into three groups which would spend one half hour receiving information and viewing resources on each level.

Department work sessions. One representative from each City Community High School department (hereafter referred to as department leaders) planned work sessions with department colleagues. Data regarding concerns recorded during planning sessions were again used by department leaders to determine what individual and group activities would be most useful. During the first week, work sessions enabled department colleagues to apply and "test out" suggestions received from presenters on space design, traffic flow, etc., by creating their own plans for their department pod. These department plans were than shared in the General Feedback Session with the entire faculty. Many issues and

potential problems surfaced in department work sessions. Department members used subsequent sessions scheduled during the second week to resolve identified problems.

General sessions. Loosely defined as large group meetings focusing on issues of concern to the entire faculty, these sessions took many forms. The program coordinator, working with a number of various groups, organized a number of diverse activities:

(1) Presentations on "Guidelines for Space Design, Noise Control and Traffic Control" and "Guidelines for Student Orientation, Discipline and Teacher Coordination in Flexible Space" run by City Community High School faculty who had attended an Open Space Workshop in July and who then worked with separate departments to apply their suggestions to specific spaces and department teaching strategies.

(2) General Feedback session consisting of presentations from department representatives detailing (through charts and lists) their own department plans for open-space design and teacher coordination.

(3) Panel on "School/Community Cooperation" featuring community representatives and a City Community High School assistant principal and focusing on activities planned to encourage community use of school facilities.

(4) Presentation on "Key Issues in Preparing for a Flexible-Space School" by a consultant requested by City Community High School faculty with whom he had previously worked. This presentation was followed by individual meetings between the consultant and various departments who shared their pod design problems with him.

(5) Presentation on "The Differentiated Semi-Rotating Schedule: Its Advantages for Teachers and Students" by a classroom teacher from another school system who had taught in a school utilizing this schedule for the previous three years.

Workshops. Workshops were designed to deal with issues identified as concerns that the Planning Committee believed could best be addressed in small groups. A few of these issues, which were expressed concerns of all departments, were: the role of teacher/advisor, media and television facilities at City Community High School, teachers' problems with student reading comprehension, and special needs students in regular classes. Therefore, workshops in these areas were designed to be offered on a rotating basis to groups of departments that comprised approximately twenty-five teachers. Each of the workshops was developed by City Community High School faculty members specializing in the content areas who were assisted by other Centre City Public Schools coordinators and directors. Those who

designed workshops were conscious of a severe time constraint. In attempting to link needs to responses, planners clearly realized that all of the identified training needs could not be met in a two-week period. Areas that dealt with (1) actually teaching specific skills or meeting the advisory needs of a yet-unknown student body or (2) responding to a thus-far unidentified community population would require follow-up once school had opened and a reality-based situation could be assessed. Nevertheless, some of the department or subject area leaders planned introductory workshops which would begin to provide information, raise questions and stimulate discussion and sharing. Others decided that flexible time made available to department members for their own use was preferable, given the time available.

Bus tour of the community. This activity was conceived and requested by the Principal who personally designed the route that four buses with approximately twenty-five faculty would take. The Principal and three assistant principals would function as tour guides in each vehicle. The tour was scheduled to occur as the last activity during the first program week. It followed two sessions dealing with community involvement in the new school: a faculty briefing session during which the Principal discussed his plans for community collaboration in the school and a panel

focusing on school-community cooperation featuring community representatives and the assistant principal who was the administrative representative on the School Advisory Council. Due to a later problem with the scheduling of buses, this tour was moved to the fourth day of the staff development program. However, the other two activities did occur in close proximity to the community tour.

Opening and closing sessions. The Principal and the Director of Staff Development invited the Superintendent, Mayor, City Manager and members of the School Committee to make presentations to the faculty during the opening and closing sessions. Presenters discussed the long years of planning and collaboration which led to the opening of this new school and expressed their enthusiasm for the facility and programs of City Community High School, since they represented the fulfillment of this long evolutionary process. They congratulated the faculty and administration on their commitment and hard work in designing and participating in this staff development program which, they believed, enhanced the ability of the school personnel to begin the new year by effectively serving the needs of the students and community.

Training Activities Designed for the Seventeen Task Areas

The staff development program described above attempted to respond to major areas of concern identified by participants as most important in their preparation for the opening of City Community High School. A total of seventeen tasks emerged from these areas of concern. These tasks were:

1. Working with department members to design the space in our department pod
2. Working with department members to formulate department rules and procedures for student behavior
3. Developing ways to orient students to their environment
4. Determining methods for controlling student and teacher noise
5. Sharing learning stations with other teachers in a pod
6. Working with department members to solve problems of teaching in flexible space
7. Creating a positive learning experience for my students in this school setting
8. Teaching new department curricula
9. Helping students with reading comprehension problems
10. Mainstreaming special needs students in my classes
11. Using new department equipment and/or materials
12. Using educational television and other media in my teaching
13. Meeting the needs of my student advisees
14. Utilizing Guidance Department services and resources

15. Adjusting to the flexible schedule
16. Meeting community needs during and after school
17. Working with administrators on school problems or concerns

In order to clarify the kinds of staff development activities designed to respond to the seventeen tasks, this chapter will conclude with a brief description of the actual training activities scheduled for each of the task areas.

Training for task areas 1-7. Training for the first seven topic areas (1-Designing Space, 2-Formulating Rules and Procedures, 3-Orienting Students, 4-Controlling Noise, 5-Sharing Learning Stations, 6-Solving Problems, and 7-Creating a Positive Learning Experience) utilized a number of flexible activities. These seven task areas were the first areas of concern addressed in the program during days one, two and three. During the first day, teachers spent time in their department pods in order to familiarize themselves with their new environment. On the second day, participants attended large group "general sessions" and received guidelines for space design, noise control, and traffic flow presented by the program coordinator and City Community High School teachers who had received prior training in pod design in July from an open space consultant. Participants next applied their learnings in "department work sessions" held in their department pod.

During work sessions, each group divided its space and set up individual learning stations to support their instructional styles and to facilitate team efforts. A final activity of this day involved a meeting between administrators and department leaders scheduled for discussion and resolution of any space design problems.

During the next day, all participants again met in a "general session" to hear suggestions on guidelines for student orientation to their spaces, discipline and teacher coordination in flexible space. They again returned to department pods to develop strategies for introducing students to their new environment, orienting students, setting up guidelines for student behavior and sharing materials and spaces with colleagues and other classes. Next, a final "General Feedback Session" was held during which a representative from each department gave a brief presentation to the total group. Presenters used charts to describe their pod design, the rules they had established for their groups and their plans for traffic flow, noise control and teacher cooperation. A recorder listed the ideas presented. During this session, teachers functioned as the "experts" and therefore learned from each other.

Training for task areas 8 and 11. Since the needs of each department in these topic areas (8-Teaching New Department Curricula and 11-Using New Department Curricula and/or

Materials) were very diverse, department members prepared for these new tasks in a variety of ways. Department leaders were responsible for using appropriate amounts of time during the many "department work sessions" to provide their members with training and exposure to new materials as well as sufficient time and guidance in working together to plan teaching strategies. During the second week, some department leaders also scheduled specific workshops for their members. These departments and the workshops offered are listed below:

Department	Workshop
Fine Arts	"Workshop in Music" Presenter: Music Director
Business	"Use of Business Equipment" Presenters: Company Representative and Business Department Leader
Industrial Arts	"Curriculum Development in Occupational Education" Presenter: Industrial Arts Department Leader
	"Operation of New Industrial Arts Equipment" Presenter: Industrial Arts Director
Math	"The New Math Individualized Learning Activities Program" Presenter: Consultant selected by Math Department Leader
Physical Education	"Operation and Use of the CCHS Pool" Presenter: Company Representative and Physical Education Director

Department	Workshop
Language Arts, Foreign Language, Math, Science, Social Studies	"Advanced Placement Programs at Your School: How to Start and Develop Them; How to Gain Parent and Community Interest and Support Presenter: Consultant selected by Department Leaders
Business, Math, Science	"The Digital Computer: Information for Teachers" Presenter: Department Head from a Centre city School
Fine Arts, Home Economics, Industrial Arts	"Basic Math Skills in Other Content Areas" Presenter: Math Department Leader

Training for task areas 9, 10 and 12. These tasks (9-Helping Students with Reading, 10-Mainstreaming Special Needs Students and 12-Using Educational Television and Other Media) were addressed through the development of three workshops attended by all participants during the second week. The sessions were offered three times on a rotating basis to small groups of approximately thirty teachers, organized by departments. Workshops offered were:

"Media and Television Production Facilities and Programs"
Presenters: Director of Instructional Media and a CCHS Educational Television Instructor

"Reading Strategies for Content Area Teachers"
Presenters: Director of Reading and two CCHS Reading Teachers

"Special Needs Students in Regular Classes: Essential Information for Teachers"
Presenters: Director of Special Education and three CCHS Special Education Teachers

Little follow-up for these workshops was possible within the program schedule. A portion of this program day had been set aside for a family picnic for all staff members. Presenters and participants expressed some frustration about the time limitations, given these important areas of focus. However, since presenters in each workshop included City Community High School faculty members, they would be available on site to continue to support colleagues who requested their assistance during the Fall semester.

Training for task areas 13 and 14. In order to respond to these areas (13-Meeting Needs of Student Advisees and 14-Utilizing Guidance Department Services and Resources), the following special training session was designed by the City Community High School Guidance Department and offered three times on a rotating basis to department groups of approximately thirty people:

"The Department of Guidance and Counseling: Information about the Teacher Advisory System and Department Services for Teachers and Students"
Presenter: City Community High School Head Counselor

This session engendered a great deal of controversy about faculty roles as student "advisors." Many expressed the belief that this role was beyond their area of responsibility. They feared that their role as advisor would result in a transfer of responsibility for discipline problems from the administration to them. This issue was raised again during

"faculty briefing sessions" in discussions between teachers and administrators. It was concluded that perceived problems would remain hypothetical and therefore unresolvable until faculty had begun to function in their new roles with their assigned students and the real situation could be assessed.

Training for task area 15. Task area 15-Adjusting to the Flexible Schedule was addressed in a number of ways. During the first "department work session" scheduled on the first day, teachers received their individual schedules and discussed these with department leaders. Therefore, they had a concrete example of exactly when their classes would meet on A, B, C, and D days and how their instructional time was divided (into periods ranging from forty-two to sixty-five minutes). Secondly, all participants attended a special "general session" entitled "The Differential Semi-Rotating Schedule: Its Advantages for Teachers and Students." During this session, a teacher from another school system, who had taught according to this schedule for three years, gave teachers a number of concrete examples of ways that the flexible time blocks and rotation of periods had enhanced her opportunities to work with her students. This presentation was followed by a "faculty briefing session" during which a City Community High School principal conducted a lively discussion with faculty about opportunities

that this schedule provided to the CCHS staff. In addition, during the two- week program, faculty used their time in "department work sessions" to share ideas about how they could schedule collaborative activities during the longer instructional periods.

Training for task area 16. Although a major activity was originally scheduled in response to task area 16-Meeting Community Needs During and After School, namely a Public Relations Day designed to allow community members to visit the school, tour facilities, attend a special program and meet with teachers, these plans were changed because of the delayed structural completion of many school facilities. Instead, during the first week, a panel on "School/Community Cooperation" facilitated by an assistant principal (the administrative representative for the already-established Parents' Advisory Council) and two community representatives (a director of a local community agency and the director of the Parks and Recreation Department) discussed community needs and projected school/community programs. A bus tour of the community, guided by the four CCHS administrators, followed this session. In addition, a workshop on "School Advisory Councils and Teachers' Roles Within Them," presented by a Centre City teacher active in community education, was offered to all teachers during the second week.

Training for task area 17. Teacher-administrative collaborative efforts aimed toward task area 17-Working with Administrators on Problems or Concerns, were woven into a number of program activities. Faculty briefing sessions, designed to encourage sharing of information and discussion of issues, were held on eight of the ten workshop days. Topics included school design, community participation, the flexible schedule, guidelines for student behavior and a myriad of organizational and procedural issues. Administrators also attended many of the general sessions and interacted informally with faculty during some department work sessions and during the family picnic. However, administrative responsibilities associated with the complex details of opening a new school did limit their participation in training activities during the two-week program.

The extent to which the training activities detailed in this chapter succeeded in positively affecting teacher attitudes toward their new tasks will be discussed in Chapter V, Display and Analysis of Data and Chapter VI, Conclusions and Recommendations. The procedures used to obtain information that led to findings presented and examined in these chapters is first discussed in Chapter IV, Methodology, which follows.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology used to collect data on the development, implementation and evaluation of a collaboratively-designed staff development program offered to support staff members opening a new flexible-space community high school. Data were collected to answer the following Research Questions:

1. How can current research findings about staff development activities that enhance professional growth be applied to a local staff development program?
2. What are the effects of a collaboratively-planned program as measured by teachers' attitudes toward new school tasks before and after the program?
3. Do teachers with diverse past experiences (department affiliations, years of teaching experience, degree levels or former school assignments) reveal different levels of attitudinal change as a result of their participation in the program?
4. What kinds of staff development activities are most effective in positively changing teachers' attitudes?
5. What new conceptualizations for future staff development research and practice emerge from this study?

Question One has been dealt with in Chapter III which describes a local staff development program from the perspective of research findings on effective staff development presented in Chapter II. Questions Two, Three and Four are

addressed in Chapter V which displays and analyzes data collected from pre- and post-questionnaires designed to measure teachers' attitudes toward new tasks identified as major concerns related to teaching in their new school. Question Five is addressed in Chapter VI through a discussion of the implications of research findings for future staff development practices and a presentation of recommendations for future areas of study.

Methodology for Data Collection

Data used to answer the research questions were collected in the form of written documents and responses to pre- and post-treatment instruments administered to program participants. Each of these methods of documentation is described in the pages which follow.

Written documents. Use of written reports (notes, memos, diagrams, etc.) to document strategies for program planning and implementation can be advantageous for a number of reasons. They can provide a wealth of information about concerns and feelings. Little special preparation is required of reporters and people are often willing to serve as recorders if the time demand is reasonable. In addition, consulting others communicates that one views their data as important (Henerson, 1978, p. 32). Disadvantages of written reports involve the fact that they require a great deal of

time to analyze and interpret. In addition, information they provide may be biased and incomplete--a problem caused by the fact that individuals' mind sets result in selective recall (Henerson, 1978, p. 32). However, in the case of this study, the large number of reporters on the Planning Committee and the diverse perspectives of their constituencies served to minimize the problem of a dominating single view.

Recognizing the advantages and disadvantages of written reports, the writer decided to use written documentation of planning and implementation strategies for the staff development program as one data collection method. During the planning process, each planning committee member took responsibility for contacting teachers as well as school and central administrators and documenting their feedback in the following areas of concern:

- school administrative issues to address
- system-wide curriculum concerns
- faculty needs for information and skill development
- faculty perceptions of their most important new tasks
- faculty feelings about themselves in relationship to important new tasks
- suggestions for kinds of training activities that would meet participant needs
- suggestions for resource people to facilitate workshops or give presentations
- suggestions for time allotments and organization of events in daily and weekly schedules

This information was recorded in the following forms:

- notes recorded by the writer at planning meetings
- reports written by department heads, central administrators and planning committee members
- charts created to organize diverse information into major thematic components
- diagrams of time blocks and activities developed for each staff development workshop day
- letters to potential participants informing them of decisions made based upon their feedback

Data collected in these formats provided information described in Chapter III, Collaborative Planning and Implementation of a Staff Development Program. The careful documentation of each step in program planning and implementation was important for a number of reasons. First, it provided planners with a rich source of participant-identified concerns and suggestions which would be used to develop a responsive staff development program. Second, it enabled planners to feed back information based on the many perspectives of teachers and administrators to their particular constituencies. This facilitated cross-communication and collaboration among many diverse groups. School and central administrators and faculty members were kept informed by and could respond to the same information at each stage of the planning process. Third, it provided the writer with a clear focus of teacher concerns about new tasks and

themselves in relation to these tasks which could be utilized in the content of pre- and post-questionnaires.

Use of a questionnaire. Pre- and post-questionnaires were designed to obtain data necessary to respond to Research Questions Two, Three and Four, namely, to examine the effect of a collaboratively-designed staff development program as measured by respondents' attitudes toward new school tasks, to determine whether teachers with diverse past experiences revealed differences in attitudinal change and to discover what kinds of staff development activities were most effective in positively changing teacher attitudes.

Like every research technique, use of a questionnaire has both advantages and disadvantages. Advantages include the fact that questionnaires can be administered to large numbers of people at the same time who can answer items with anonymity and without concerns about fear or embarrassment. Thus, the chances of receiving responses which genuinely represent a person's beliefs or feelings are increased (Orlich, 1975, p. 3). In addition, questionnaires can include checklists and ratings which may be too time-consuming or unwieldy if read by an interviewer and respondents' answers are not affected by the characteristics or biases of an interviewer (Dyer, 1979, p. 157). Structured questions enable each respondent to receive the same set of questions phrased exactly the same way. Thus, comparability

in phrasing can help to standardize the response (Sax, 1979, p. 245).

Henerson (1978) points out that questionnaires provide greater uniformity across situations than do interviews and therefore the data they provide can be more easily analyzed and interpreted than data received from oral responses (p. 29). However, score results from instruments may need to be supplemented and corroborated with other kinds of information.

Disadvantages of questionnaires include the fact that they do not provide the flexibility of an interview where an idea or comment can be explored and the researcher has an opportunity to determine how the question is being interpreted by the respondent. In addition, people are often more able to easily express their ideas orally than in writing (Henerson, 1978, p. 30). It is difficult to assess the motivation of a respondent to a questionnaire since no personal interaction takes place (Orlich, 1975, p. 4). Finally, problems with the return and completion of questionnaires often exist. The percentage of returns depends upon questionnaire length, question complexity, the importance of the study as determined by the respondent and the extent to which the respondent believes his or her answers are important. Therefore, if all questionnaires are not completed,

it is important to obtain a random sampling of all members (Sax, 1979, pp. 245-246).

The decision to rely upon pre- and post-questionnaires as a major method for data collection was made after considering the above factors. This method enabled the writer (1) to obtain standardized and comparable responses from the large number of program participants who could answer questions anonymously at one time, (2) to measure their attitudes toward new tasks which were the focus of the staff development program and (3) to obtain their assessments of the variety of staff development activities in which they participated.

Design of the questionnaire. The questionnaire first utilized factual questions to obtain demographic information about respondents. Orlich (1975) suggests that a questionnaire should begin with easy, non-threatening informational questions which are "short, unoffensive and allow the respondent to become accustomed to completing items" (p. 31). Therefore, participants were first asked to indicate their department affiliation, years of teaching experience, highest degree held and their status as former City High School teachers or teachers from other Centre City schools. In addition, faculty members were asked to place a four-digit identification number, known only to them, on each

questionnaire so that their pre- and post-responses could be anonymously compared.

Henerson (1978) recommends using questions with closed formats for questionnaires that are administered to more than twenty to thirty respondents (p. 61). Closed questions are also advantageous because, according to Dyer (1979), "They are easy to code and analyze, make answers comparable from individual to individual and define rather clearly the intent of most questions" (p. 159). Following factual questions, the questionnaire (shown in Appendices A and B) cited seventeen task areas which focused upon assessing teacher attitudes toward new tasks that had been documented as major concerns during program planning stages and that subsequently had become the focus of the staff development program activities. These tasks were:

1. Working with department members to design the space in our department pod
2. Working with department members to formulate department rules and procedures for student behavior
3. Developing ways to orient students to their environment
4. Determining methods for controlling student and teacher noise
5. Sharing learning stations with other teachers in a pod
6. Working with department members to solve problems of teaching in flexible space
7. Creating a positive learning experience for my students in this school setting
8. Teaching new department curricula

9. Helping students with reading comprehension problems
10. Mainstreaming special needs students in my classes
11. Using new department equipment and/or materials
12. Using educational television and other media in my teaching
13. Meeting the needs of my student advisees
14. Utilizing Guidance Department services and resources
15. Adjusting to the flexible schedule
16. Meeting community needs during and after school
17. Working with administators on school problems or concerns

In order to assess teachers' attitudes toward these tasks before and after the training program, the writer associated six attitudes with each task. Words describing the six attitudes were culled by the writer from notes taken during the planning sessions. Teachers' feelings about the important new tasks discussed during planning sessions centered consistently around the extent to which they felt (1) experienced or inexperienced, (2) prepared or unprepared and (3) enthusiastic or apprehensive about performing these tasks. In addition, faculty feelings about themselves in relation to the task focused on whether the task appeared to them to be (4) easy or difficult, (5) familiar or unfamiliar and (6) important or unimportant.

These six attitudes toward new tasks could be effectively measured by using the semantic differential, an

attitude rating scale with a series of adjectives and their antonyms listed on opposite sides of a continuum. The semantic differential is generally considered to be a good tool for measuring positive and negative feelings toward an attitude object (Henerson, 1978, p. 89). Smith (1975) claims that it has been found to have good predictive validity (p. 155). The following example of a closed question in the questionnaire which utilizes this format is:

5. Sharing learning stations with other teachers in a pod

(I am)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)							
difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

Respondents were asked to circle the number in each item that best expressed their feelings about each task. For each question, as the above example illustrates, six degrees and no mid-point were used to encourage forced choice between attitudes on either end of the scale. In addition, random polarity, the placing of positive and negative adjectives alternately on either side of the scale, was introduced to avoid response set.

Although a closed question format for this questionnaire seemed most appropriate, given the number of potential

respondents (89) and the time available for administration of the questionnaire (20 minutes) the inclusion of some open-ended questions seemed advisable to allow for flexibility. As Henerson (1978) says, "Most questionnaires include one or two open-ended items . . . to permit some ventilation of feelings, to uncover unanticipated outcomes, and to obtain some unprompted responses" (p. 61)

While the first seventeen closed questions were identical in the pre- and post-questionnaires to allow for comparability, open questions in each instrument differed. The pre-questionnaire contained one open-ended question: "The three things I would like this workshop to accomplish are:" The post-questionnaire contained three open-ended questions: "The three things I liked most about this workshop were:," "The three things I liked least about this workshop were:" and "The things we should have covered but didn't were:"

Pilot testing the questionnaire. The questionnaire was administered separately to a pilot group of eight individuals who were not planning to participate in the staff development program but who were familiar with the planning process which led to the identification of tasks and the program design. This pilot helped to uncover problems in the phrasing of items and in question design. Suggestions for revisions and improvements were discussed at length with each respondent. As a result of critiques and feedback from the pilot

group which focused on clarity of directions and phrasing of task statements, a number of changes were made. Directions for respondents and three task statements were rewritten. One ambiguous item was eliminated; spacing was improved and use of random polarity was introduced to avoid response set. Furthermore, an additional section in the post-questionnaire which asked respondents to rank order the staff development activities in which they participated was eliminated due to time constraints identified by the pilot group. Instead, the writer decided to rely upon answers to open-ended questions to obtain participant assessments of the effectiveness of various staff development activities.

Administration of the questionnaire. The pre- and post-questionnaires were administered to a large group of participants during the first general session scheduled before staff development activites began and during the last large group meeting, immediately preceding the general closing session. Participants, who were seated in a small auditorium in the new school, received verbal directions from the writer. Because attendance was voluntary, all participants did not attend all meetings. Ninety-eight faculty members attended either the opening or closing sessions. Administration of the questionnaire was one activity within these sessions. The ninety-eight individuals who answered at least one questionnaire fall into the following categories:

- 87 teachers answered the pre-questionnaire (11 members were absent)
- 77 teachers answered the post-questionnaire (21 members were absent)
- 66 teachers attended both sessions and therefore answered the pre- and post-questionnaires

For purposes of comparability, data obtained from the sixty-six matched pairs of pre and post-questionnaires have been utilized to respond to Research Questions Two, Three and Four. These sixty-six individuals attended the full two-week staff development program and thus their answers have greater validity for research findings.

Questionnaire validity. The validity of a questionnaire can be measured by determining whether the instrument is an appropriate tool for measuring what one wants to know. Henerson (1978) indicates that in program evaluation, primary concern is with construct validity and content validity (p. 134).

Construct validity (how well the instrument measures what it claims to do) was determined through consultation with individuals (teachers and administrators who were participants in the planning sessions and thus were familiar with the goals of the program and attitudes which planners expressed about their new tasks). Pilot testing was conducted to ensure that the constructs (atttitudes) chosen for the instrument were clearly defined and understood and that

questionnaire format and instructions did not predispose respondents to answer in a particular way. In addition, response bias, which may be due to desire to please or evaluation apprehension (fear of being judged negatively), were counteracted in verbal directions given by the writer who stressed the anonymity of the questionnaire and the importance of honest responses.

Content validity (how well the items give appropriate emphasis to the various components of the instrument) was also considered in the questionnaire design. Orlich (1975) stresses, "When you rely on more than one question to assess an attitude, the response reliability is greater" (p. 50) and Henerson (1978) points out that "Often attitude measurements rely on a single question to detect the presence or extent of an attitude. A single-item is open to myriad errors of interpretation and formulation of a response" (p. 145). So that too much emphasis was not given to a single sub-area of potential attitudes in the assessment instruments, each of the seventeen questions presented the same six attitudes for measurement, and an additive scale which used five of these items was created during the computer analysis phase.

Questionnaire reliability. The reliability of an instrument involves what Wiersma (1969) defines as "the consistency of the test in measuring whatever it does measure" (p.

185) and what Sax (1979) explains as "the extent to which measurements reflect true (nonrandom) individual differences" (p. 226). Therefore, reliability reflects the degree to which measurement results are "free of unpredictable kinds of error" (Henerson, 1978, p. 146). The sources of error that affect reliability include fluctuations in respondents' moods or alertness, variations in circumstances of questionnaire administration, including distractions, or inconsistencies and oversights in giving directions (Henerson, 1978, p. 146). In order to counteract these potential difficulties, procedures for the administration of the questionnaires were carefully planned to provide respondents with clarity in direction, adequate time and a comfortable, quiet environment. Reliability can also be affected by respondents who circle attitude alternatives without trying to understand them. Therefore, respondents to the pre- and post-questionnaires were given clear directions and were apprised of the importance of their honest responses prior to each administration. In addition, the use of random polarity of positive or negative attitudes, which encouraged participants' close attention to each item was used to avoid a possible set response to each item.

Preparation for Data Analysis

In order to prepare pre- and post-questionnaire data for analysis, returned post-questionnaires were matched by individual identification numbers with each respondent's pre-test questionnaire. Unmatched questionnaires (pre-tests with no post-test or vice versa) were eliminated from the analysis.

Data were prepared (keypunched) for input into the University of Massachusetts Control Data Corporation Cyber 170 Computer. Each case for analysis contained an identification number, responses to four demographic items, all pre-test task area responses and all post-test task area responses. Each case contained 209 variables. Visual scanning of questionnaires with data cards was used to verify keypunching.

Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), items with low positive scores (due to the random polarity format of the questionnaire) were recoded so that each response scale yielded higher numbers for positive attitudes. Thus, these items' responses became consistent with all other items. Frequency counts of all 209 variables were produced as a final check for keypunching accuracy.

Once data were "cleaned," variables were divided into three categories: (1) demographic information; (2) pre-questionnaire variables determining respondents' attitudes

toward the importance of tasks chosen for focus in the workshop; and (3) variables used to measure the additional five pre- and post-treatment attitudes which were combined into an additive scale.

In the first category, demographic variables, a cross-tabulation of former City High School staff and staff from other Centre City schools with department affiliation, degree levels and years of teaching experience, was tabulated.

In the second category, one of the six attitudes, the degree to which respondents viewed the seventeen tasks as important or unimportant, was measured from data in the pre-questionnaire. A frequency count with means and standard deviations was used with these variables to determine whether the seventeen tasks which comprised the focus of the two-week program were considered by participants to be important tasks to address before they began the program. This method was used to determine whether the collaborative planning process had resulted in identifying areas of focus that were considered by the participants to be important areas of concern for them. In addition, a summative scale of importance was tabulated and a breakdown of responses by demographic data was computed to determine if any of the demographic groups found particular areas to be of greater or lesser importance than did the total group.

The third category utilized five semantic differential scales dealing with participants' experience or inexperience, preparedness or unpreparedness and enthusiasm or apprehension for each of the seventeen tasks, as well as their view of the tasks as difficult or easy and familiar or unfamilar. Additive scales measuring pre-treatment attitudes toward task areas and post-treatment attitudes toward task areas were created by examining each task area of each respondent's data set. A count of valid responses was made and selected if respondents had answered three or more of the scale's five items. These responses were added together and divided by the number of items answered. Thus, a task area's additive scale response was based on the same scale of "one" to "six" that the original items contained. Cases which contained both adequate pre-treatment and adequate post-treatment responses were selected for analysis.

Means and standard deviations for task area scales were produced and two tailed t-tests were tabulated to examine the degree and direction of attitudinal change. The t-tests utilized the .05 level of significance, which is widely accepted as a measurement by studies in the social sciences.

An additional set of task area scales was created by subtracting each respondent's pre-treatment scale score from his/her post-treatment scale score. The result of this

became a newly-created "change variable." The change variables were used as dependent variables and demographic data items were used as independent variables in a one way analysis of variance which determined significant and insignificant differences between the groups in demographic categories. An analysis of variance can validly be run for groups which are similar in size. If groups are of different sizes (as in this study) the mean scores of individuals within the group must be similar so that the mean is an accurate reflection of all respondents' scores within that group. In this study, because demographic groups were not the same size, a Duncan multiple range test was first run to see if a one way analysis of variance could be used to test for statistical significance. The Duncan procedure examines the characteristics of responses to determine if the mean score of a group is an accurate reflection of individuals in the group. If this is the case, the group means will fall into one subset. If groups fall into more than one subset, variability within the groups exists and it is therefore inappropriate to compare this group's mean score with another group's mean score and to conclude that individuals in one group differ significantly from individuals in another group. In those task areas where the pattern of responses among a particular subgroup revealed that these groups fell into more than one subset, an analysis of variance was not

possible. For those groups which comprised one subset, analysis of variance was run.

Respondents' answers to all open-ended questions in the pre- and post-treatment questionnaires were read and all meaningful phrases were recorded in the exact words used by the writers. Answers were categorized according to similar theme. These comments have been utilized in conjunction with data from other questions to examine the effects of the staff development program. Display and analysis of data are found in Chapter V, which follows.

C H A P T E R V

DISPLAY AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter will discuss how a collaboratively-designed and implemented staff development program affects the attitudes of a diverse group of participants and why certain training activities seem to have been more or less effective in changing attitudes--positively or negatively. Analysis relies upon participants' self-report of their attitudes toward seventeen tasks which became the focus of the staff development program. These tasks were:

1. Working with department members to design the space in our department pod
2. Working with department members to formulate department rules and procedures for student behavior
3. Developing ways to orient students to their environment
4. Determining methods for controlling student and teacher noise
5. Sharing learning stations with other teachers in a pod
6. Working with department members to solve problems of teaching in flexible space
7. Creating a positive learning experience for my students in this school setting
8. Teaching new department curricula
9. Helping students with reading comprehension problems

10. Mainstreaming special needs students in my classes
11. Using new department equipment and/or materials
12. Using educational television and other media in my teaching
13. Meeting the needs of my student advisees
14. Utilizing Guidance Department services and resources
15. Adjusting to the flexible schedule
16. Meeting community needs during and after school
17. Working with administrators on school problems or concerns

Data utilized in this chapter were obtained from sixty-six matched pairs of pre- and post-treatment questionnaires administered to teachers before and after the two-week staff development program. Information collected will be utilized to answer Research Questions Two, Three and Four. In order to present results of the questionnaire, Research Questions have been further defined. The major questions and their component parts are as follows:

Research Question Two: What are the effects of a collaboratively-planned staff development program as measured by teachers' attitudes toward new school tasks before and after the program?

a. How important did participants rate those tasks chosen during the planning process to be the focus of the program?

b. Toward which of the seventeen task areas did participants evidence:

   - a positive attitudinal change or
   - a negative attitudinal change?

Research Question Three: Do teachers with diverse past experiences reveal different levels of attitudinal change as a result of their participation in the program?

a. Do teachers from City High School who were, over a longer period of time, involved in planning for the new school, evidence different degrees of attitudinal change than do teachers from other Centre City schools?

b. Do teachers from different departments evidence different degrees of attitudinal change?

c. Do teachers who have had more or less prior training (indicated by degree levels of B.A., M.A., or C.A.G.S.) reveal different degrees of attitudinal change?

d. Do teachers with various amounts of teaching experience evidence different degrees of attitudinal change?

Research Question Four: What kinds of staff development activities are most effective in positively changing teacher attitudes?

a. Within this local situation, what tasks were most effectively addressed in a two-week staff development program?

b. What common ingredients emerge from task area training activities resulting in statistically significant positive attitudinal change?

c. What common ingredients emerge from task area training resulting in statistically insigificant attitudinal change?

Since Research Questions have been addressed from data reflecting the attitudes of the total group as well as attitudes of demographic sub-groups, demographic data reporting respondents' status as former City High School faculty or faculty from other Centre City schools, their department affiliation, degree levels and years of teaching experience are first presented. The grouping of respondents by demographics has been used to assess the relationship between

individuals' past experience and the degrees of attitudinal change they report in pre- and post-treatment questionnaires.

Demographic Grouping of Participants

In Table 1, respondents have been divided into subgroups represented by their former teaching assignments at City High School or at other Centre City schools. These subgroups have been cross-tabulated first with respondents' subject area assignments, represented by eleven curricular areas, and second with their degree levels and years of teaching experience.

As Table 1 indicates, 60.6 percent of the respondents had previously taught at City High School. These teachers had more extensive opportunities to plan for the new school through a federally-funded inservice program offered to them on-site over a period of three years. The other 39.4 percent of the respondents had come from other junior and senior high schools in Centre City. This group had had far less opportunity to become familiar with planned programs or with the City High School students who would comprise over 50 percent of the new student population at City Community High School.

An examination of the group by curricular areas indicates that although the sixty-six respondents did not

TABLE 1

DISPLAY OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Breakdown of Participants by Former School Assignment and Department

	Fine Arts	Business	Lang. Arts	F. Lang./ Bi-Ling.	Guid./ Media	Ind. Arts	Math	Phys. Ed.	Science	Soc. St.	Spec. Ed.	Total
Old City High School	2	5	6	3	5	3	6	0	5	5	0	40
	3%	7.6%	9.1%	4.5%	7.6%	4.5%	9.1%	0	7.6%	7.6%	0	60.6%
Other Centre City Schools	1	0	5	1	2	2	3	4	2	1	5	26
	1.5%	0%	7.6%	1.5%	3.0%	3.1%	4.5%	6.1%	3.0%	1.5%	7.6%	39.4%
TOTAL #	3	5	11	4	7	5	9	4	7	6	5	66
%	4.5%	7.6%	16.7%	6.0%	10.6%	7.6%	13.6%	6.1%	10.6%	9.1%	7.6%	100%

Breakdown of Participants by Former School Assignment, Degree and Years of Teaching Experience

	Degree Levels				
	BA	MA	CAGS	Ed.D	TOTAL
Old City High School	2	23	14	1	40
	3.0%	34.9%	21.2%	1.5%	60.6%
Other Centre City Schools	6	20	0	0	26
	9.1%	30.3%	0	0	39.4%
TOTAL #	8	43	14	1	66
%	12.1%	65.2%	21.2%	1.5%	100%

	Years of Teaching Experience					
	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	over 20	TOTAL
Old City High School	4	5	15	7	9	40
	6.1%	7.6%	22.7%	10.6%	13.6%	60.6%
Other Centre City Schools	3	9	7	4	3	26
	4.5%	13.6%	10.6%	6.1%	4.6%	39.4%
TOTAL #	7	14	22	11	12	66
%	10.6%	21.2%	33.3%	16.7%	18.2%	100%

comprise the total faculty, the number of department members in each department subgroup was representative of the school-wide department sizes. Thus, all curricular areas were represented in data collected in proportion to their approximate size within the new school.

Those areas with the largest number of educational personnel were Language Arts (16.7 percent), Math (13.6 percent), Science (10.6 percent), Social Studies (9.1 percent) and Guidance/Media (10.6 percent). This last subgroup combined Guidance and Library Media personnel since they represented student support services rather than classroom instruction. Business and Industrial Arts each represented 7.6 percent of the staff, as did the new Special Education Department. Physical Education, which comprised slightly less faculty (6.1 percent) is paralleled by the Foreign Language/Bi-Lingual Department (6.0 percent). Fine Arts (Art and Music) represents the smallest subgroup (4.5 percent). Most departments contained a majority of teachers from City High School. However, the Physical Education and Special Education Departments were staffed entirely by teachers from other Centre City Schools. This is the logical consequence of the entirely new Special Education services to be offered to a new special needs student population and to the extensive new physical education program

designed to utilize the new school's impressive sports facilities.

A breakdown of participants by degree level indicates that a large majority (87 percent) of the staff had earned graduate degrees (a desired qualification for all high school teachers in Centre City). In addition, 21 percent of the staff (all from City High School) had CAGS degrees (a phenomenon reflecting the opportunity provided to City High teachers to do graduate study through the three-year federal training project working at their school prior to the move to City Community High School). In contrast, none of the teachers from the other Centre City schools had more than a master's degree. An examination of degree levels of the group as a whole indicates that they were beginning to participate in a training program after having had a significant amount of previous educational training which may have prepared them in varying degrees to perform new tasks at their new school.

Data reflecting respondents' years of teaching experience indicate that approximately 70 percent had been teaching for more than 10 years and nearly twenty percent had taught for over 20 years. In contrast, only 10 percent had taught for five years or less. A comparison of the City High School versus Centre City Schools subgroups shows that City High teachers represented the more experienced group

(78 percent had taught over 10 years) in comparison with 53 percent of the other Centre City School group. The total picture indicates that respondents were, on the whole, quite experienced in teaching in traditionally-organized secondary schools. Their years of teaching in Centre City schools, however, would not reflect practical experience in a new flexible space community high school, since City Community High School is the first of its kind in Centre City.

Importance of Task Areas (Whole-Group Participant Rating)

Data from the pre-questionnaires were first utilized to answer the Research Question, "How important did participants rate those tasks chosen during the planning process to be the focus of the program?" Respondents were asked to rate each of the seventeen tasks as "unimportant" or "important" on a scale of "1" to "6." Results from these answers were used to determine whether the collaborative planning process involving a broad spectrum of representatives from the school and central administration as well as diverse departments resulted in a program design that clearly identified areas of focus considered by participants to be important areas of concern for them.

Table 2 displays data obtained from this process: the number of respondents, the mean score and standard deviation tabulated for each task and the percentage of respondents

TABLE 2

IMPORTANCE OF TASK AREAS (WHOLE GROUP PARTICIPANT RATING)

#	Topic Areas	N	Mean	S.D.	% of 6.0 Rating
1	Working with department members to design space in our department pod.	64	5.766	.707	83%
2	Working with department members to form department rules and procedures for student behavior	65	5.708	.785	80%
3	Developing ways to orient students to their environment	64	5.688	.531	72%
4	Determining methods for controlling noise	62	5.629	.773	76%
5	Sharing learning stations with other teachers in a pod	61	5.656	.629	72%
6	Working with department membes to solve problems of teaching in flexible space	61	5.590	.864	72%
7	Creating a positive learning experience for my students in this school setting	63	5.746	.740	83%
8	Teaching new department curricula	57	5.877	.331	88%
9	Helping students with reading comprehension problems	55	5.764	.744	84%
10	Mainstreaming special needs students in my class	58	5.552	.921	72%
11	Using new department curricula and/or materials	61	5.475	1.043	69%
12	Using educaitonal television and other media in my teaching	59	5.203	1.297	59%
13	Meeting the needs of my student advisees	60	5.450	1.048	70%
14	Utilizing Guidance Department services and resources	63	5.635	.725	76%
15	Adjusting to the flexible schedule	60	5.550	.946	75%
16	Meeting community needs during and after school	60	5.517	.873	70%
17	Working with administrators in problems or concerns	63	5.762	.714	70%

who rated task areas as a "6," the highest rating. Since respondents were asked in verbal and written directions to answer only those questions that applied to their roles in the school, every person did not answer every question. However, the first column in Table 2 indicates that the majority of respondents considered each task to be relevant to their role. In the second column, mean scores tabulated for each task reveal that all of the task areas were rated as "important" or "very important," receiving a mean score ranging between a "5" and "6." In addition, as the third column indicates, task areas reflected small standard deviations. The large majority of respondents' answers clustered around the importance rating. In fact, the fourth column in Table 2 reveals that in each case a majority of respondents gave each task area the highest rating of importance, a "6."

Importance of Task Areas (Participant Rating by Demographic SubGroups)

The above findings lead us next to question how various subgroups rated the importance of task areas. Did individuals representing different departments, various amounts of training and years of experience or former school assignments consider tasks to be more or less important to them? Were the concerns of individuals from each of these subgroups adequately represented during the planning process?

Answers to these questions surface in Table 3 which displays a breakdown of the importance rating by demographic subgroups (curricular areas, degree levels, years of experience and former school assignment). An examination of each of these areas indicates a uniformity of task ratings. No statistically significant difference exists between the mean scores of any of the subgroups. In addition, respondents in each subgroup, reflecting diverse subject areas interests, varying amounts of prior graduate training, few or many years of teaching experience and different assignments at City High School or other Centre City schools all rated the importance of task areas as uniformly high. The new faculty at City Community High School, through a collaborative planning process, as data in Tables 2 and 3 indicate, were able to identify new school concerns which transcended individual concerns of a particular subgroup. The tasks chosen by the planning committee represented areas relevant to a large majority of participants in the staff development program.

Changes in Participant Attitudes Toward Task Areas

Identifying key concerns is an important first step in designing a responsive staff development program. Developing activities which respond to these concerns represents the next challenge. The effect of training activities offered during the staff development program has been measured

TABLE 3

IMPORTANCE OF TASK AREAS (PARTICIPANT RATING BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBGROUP)

Department Mean Scores

SSt.	P.E.	F.A.	Sp.Ed.	I.A.	Math	L.A.	Sci.	Bus.	F. Lang.	G/M
5.15	5.33	5.49	5.55	5.55	5.66	5.71	5.73	5.76	5.77	5.86

Degree Level Mean Scores

MA	CAGS	BA
5.59	5.60	5.79

Years of Experience Mean Scores

Over 20	11-15	0-5	6-10	16-20
5.34	5.63	5.66	5.72	5.77

Former School Assignment Mean Scores

Other Schools	Former CHS
5.62	5.62

in this study by assessing changes in participants' attitudes toward seventeen tasks which became the focus of the program. In order to discover what training activities were most effective in changing teacher attitudes, a number of procedures were utilized.

Changes in respondents' attitudes toward seventeen task areas were measured by using an additive scale. The scale combined respondents' ratings of tasks in five of the semantic differential scales. These scales had been administered in the pre- and post-treatment questionnaires. Mean scores of the pre- and post-scales reflected respondents' assessments of their "experience" or "inexperience," "preparedness" or "unpreparedness" and "enthusiasm" or "apprehension" with regard to each of the seventeen tasks as well as their view of the tasks as "difficult" or "easy" and "familiar" or "unfamiliar." The difference in mean scores found by comparing the pre- and post-scales indicates the degree of positive or negative attitudinal change toward the task areas. Table 4 displays the results of this process.

Table 4 provides information relevant to the next Research Question, "Toward which of the seventeen task areas did participants evidence a positive attitudinal change or a negative attitudinal change?" Answers to this question will utilize means and standard deviations for each task area and will cite results of two-tailed t-tests (sign at the .05

TABLE 4

T-TEST OF PRE-POST TASK AREA SCALES

#	Task Areas	N	Pre-Test Mean	Pre-Test SD	Post-Test Mean	Post-Test SD	T-Test of Difference Between Pre and Post-Test Means	#
1	Working with department members to design space in our department pod	59	3.93	.95	4.64	.89	+.71*	1
2	Working with department members to form department rules and procedures for student behavior	59	4.21	.93	4.75	.90	+.54*	2
3	Developing ways to orient students to their environment	61	3.93	.96	4.32	.97	+.39*	3
4	Determining methods for controlling noise	61	3.68	1.08	3.98	1.07	+.39*	3
5	Sharing learning stations with other teachers in a pod	57	3.80	1.32	4.23	1.13	+.43*	5
6	Working with department members to solve problems of teaching in flexible space	57	3.55	1.11	4.19	1.09	+.64*	6
7	Creating a positive learning experience for my students in this setting	60	3.96	1.22	4.27	1.08	+.31*	7
8	Teaching new department curricula	56	4.35	1.13	4.45	1.04	+.10	8
9	Helping students with reading comprehension	49	3.62	1.54	3.83	1.37	+.21	9

*statistically significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4 (cont.)

#	Task Areas	N	Pre-Test Mean	Pre-Test SD	Post-Test Mean	Post-Test SD	T-Test of Difference Between Pre and Post-Test Means	#
10	Mainstreaming special needs students in my class	55	3.56	1.40	3.67	1.38	+.11	10
11	Using new department curricula and/or materials	56	4.72	.96	4.60	.98	-.13	11
12	Using educational television and other media in my teaching	53	3.51	1.37	3.66	1.40	+.15	12
13	Meeting needs of my student advisees	51	4.07	1.23	4.00	1.19	-.07	13
14	Utilizing Guidance department services and resources	55	4.78	1.00	4.72	.97	-.05	14
15	Adjusting to the flexible schedule	54	3.14	1.11	3.71	1.04	+.57*	15
16	Meeting community needs during and after school	52	3.82	1.05	3.90	1.12	+.08	16
17	Working with administrators in problems or concerns	57	4.80	.97	4.72	1.14	-.08	17

*statistically significant at the .05 level.

level) to determine the statistical significance of any change.

Possible attitudinal changes fall into four categories: statistically significant positive attitudinal change, statistically insignificant positive attitudinal change, statistically significant negative attitudinal change and statistically insignificant negative attitudinal change. During analysis of these changes, discussion will relate findings in this study to another method used for attitudinal measurement, the Concerns Based Adoption Model, developed by Loucks and Hall (1977). CBAM identifies seven stages of concern experienced by individuals facing change. These stages (more fully described in Chapter II, p. 40) are: (0) Awareness (little concern or involvement), (1) Informational (interest in learning about the change), (2) Personal (uncertainty about demands of the change upon them personally), (3) Management (concern about implementation of the change), (4) Consequence (concern about the effect of the change on students), (5) Collaboration (desire to cooperate with others regarding the change) and (6) Refocusing (interest in even more powerful alternatives). Analysis of changes in teachers' attitudes toward the seventeen tasks which comprise the program focus will draw on the above perspectives to further analyze participants' needs

and the effectiveness of training activities designed to meet them.

Statistically significant positive attitudinal change. Table 4 reveals that in eight task areas, respondents showed a positive attitudinal change, statistically significant at the .05 level. These areas are:

1. Working with department members to design space in our department pod
2. Working with department members to form department rules and procedures for student behavior
3. Developing ways to orient students to their environment
4. Determining methods for controlling student and teacher noise
5. Sharing learning stations with other teachers in a pod
6. Working with department members to solve problems of teaching in flexible space
7. Creating a positive learning experience for my students in this school setting
15. Adjusting to the flexible schedule

It is interesting to note that those areas in which respondents evidenced a significant positive change were tasks that received primary and ongoing focus in the staff development program. Areas one to seven were addressed during the first three days of the training program because they were considered by the planning committee to be first priority personal concerns. All of the tasks cited focus directly upon the new space/time environment in which

teachers were to be functioning (designing a comfortable instructional space, formulating operating procedures, teaching according to a new flexible schedule, etc.). In order to feel comfortable with these new tasks, teachers obviously needed information, answers to questions about how they personally would be affected by their new environment and skills in organizing and managing the environment to satisfy their instructional needs. These concerns reflect levels (1) Informational, (2) Personal and (3) Management of the Concerns Based Adoption Model developed by Loucks and Hall (1977). Having identified these concerns, let us next examine the extent to which training activities offered an appropriate response.

Because tasks listed above were high-priority concerns, a large amount of time was allotted for a variety of training activities focusing on the school environment. Training sessions provided participants with "general sessions" (to learn new information), "department work sessions" (to apply learnings and define roles and procedures) and a "general feedback session" (to share learnings with the total group). Each of the sessions was facililtated by school resource people who had received prior training; therefore, no outside consultant was involved. In addition, preparations for tasks (1) to (7) were all characterized by group efforts. Teachers were placed in the roles of active

learners sharing with their colleagues. Each department worked as a unit to set up their learning areas and operating procedures. Together, they planned to meet student needs in their new flexible environment. Task (15), "Adjusting to the Flexible Schedule" also received a significant amount of attention during the program. Teachers received their schedules and discussed them on the first day during "department work sessions." Schedules were used during space design sessions as teachers identified the spaces they would use and ways they would collaborate during each period. Schedules were also addressed at the "faculty briefing sessions" and in a large group presentation offered during the second week.

As a group, the areas revealing the most positive attitudinal change, in contrast to the other tasks, represented concrete and definable issues (designing a space, creating rules, understanding a schedule, etc.) which were achievable in the time allotted and largely accomplishable without students before the opening of school, even though changes might be made during the Fall semester.

In summary, a number of common ingredients seem to exist for those task areas in which teachers evidenced statistically significant attitudinal change. These ingredients included: (1) high motivation (desire to deal with issues identified by the planning committee as first-

priority matters), (2) time (sufficient to address a variety of "stages of concern"), (3) flexible training activities (offering a number of different ways to actively learn by applying learnings and featuring collegial sharing and support) and (4) realistic goals (that were appropriate to the situation, defined and achievable, given the local conditions characterizing this program). For these task areas, a fortuitous match occurred between stages of concern and responsive training. Therefore, it is not surprising that with regard to their environment, respondents also evidenced significant attitudinal change in task area, (7) Creating a positive learning experience for my students in this school setting. This particular task, the only one in this category which specifically mentions students, may reflect some movement toward a higher stage of concern on the CBAM, Stage (4) Consequence. During the fourth stage, individuals, having dealt with personal and management concerns, may have felt more able to focus on the impact of space changes upon their students.

Statistically insignificant positive attitudinal change. Those areas which also revealed a positive attitudinal change, although not statistically significant at the .05 level, were:

8. Teaching new department curricula
9. Helping students with reading comprehension

10. Mainstreaming special needs students in my class

12. Using educational television and other media in my teaching

16. Meeting community needs during and after school

The above task areas had all been the focus of one to two-hour workshops designed by local resource people, most of whom were City Community High staff members. However, given the emphasis upon generous amounts of time allotted to "department work sessions," these training activities did not receive central focus or large time allotments. Also, considering the nature of these tasks, which each involved working with yet-unknown students and community members, training activities were designed as "introductions" to new task areas or roles. All participants received the same training for four of the above Task Areas, 9, 10, 12, and 16. In Task Area (8) "Teaching new department curricula," participants in various departments received different amounts of training which ranged from a number of workshops (designed by their department leaders or subject area directors) to dependence on more informal meetings in "department work sessions" in those departments that favored more independent work time. These flexible activities were designed to respond to participants who represented a variety of levels of concern in terms of curricula, ranging from "personal" concerns about demands of an innovation all the way to "collaboration," desire to coordinate with others

regarding curricular innovations. Nevertheless, it was clear that real change would continue to be a long-term developmental process. Additional support would be needed to deal with these complex tasks during the school year.

In contrast to the first category of tasks revealing significant positive change, Areas 8, 9, 10, 12, and 16 had been allotted less time and fewer flexible training activities. In addition, training had not been designed as a group effort. Each of these tasks was confronted primarily as an individual concern as participants received information from presenters and then pondered how they themselves would deal with reading problems or mainstreamed students or how they would work with community members in their classes. These ponderings represent lower stages of concern on the CBAM, needs for more information, Stage (1) and for answers about how these tasks will affect them personally, Stage (2). In order to evidence significantly more positive attitudes toward these tasks, participants need the opportunity to function at higher stages of concern, Stage (3) Management, as they learn to perform these new tasks effectively and Stage (4), Consequence, as they analyze the impact of their new strategies on students. Reaching these higher stages requires ongoing support from the resource people at City Community High School who had made the initial workshop presentations. Therefore, although respondents indicated

some positive attitudinal change toward tasks in this second category, continued support was needed to increase positive attitudes and facilitate the movement toward higher stages of concern.

Statistically significant negative attitude change. None of the seventeen task areas revealed statistically significant negative attitudinal change. Respondents, as a result of their participation in the two-week program, did not feel significantly less "prepared," "experienced" or "enthusiastic" about tasks and did not view tasks as significantly more "difficult" or "unfamiliar."

Statistically insigificant negative attitudinal change. Those tasks which evidenced statistically insignificant negative attitudinal change were:

11. Using new department curricula and/or materials
13. Meeting the needs of my student advisees
14. Utilizing Guidance Department services and resources
17. Working with administrators on problems or concerns

Task Area 11, "Using new department curricula and/or materials" had been an acknowledged concern of participants since many new materials and curricular guides had not been available for examination or use before the staff development program began. Therefore, stages of concern were very basic. Participants needed information about these

materials and were concerned personally about how new curricula materials would meet both teacher and student needs. Varying amounts of time during "department work sessions" and during some workshops were available for perusal of materials, but actual use of supplies (which could begin to address management concerns) could take place only after the school had opened. Therefore, time and training activities for use of materials during the summer program were minimal and accomplishment of this task continued to be a long-term goal involving a process of material adaptation to teaching style and student need.

Tasks 13 and 14, which involve meeting the needs of student advisees and using Guidance Department services and resources, are interesting tasks for discussion. Time allotments for training in these areas proved to be inadequate because of a number of unanticipated developments. The role of teacher-advisor was introduced in rotating workshops facilitated by the City Community High School Head Counselor and attended by small groups of teachers at one time. The Advisory Program was further discussed by administrators and teachers in a "faculty briefing session." Unexpected controversy arose during these sessions as participants learned more about the pre-established advisory program design. Individuals expressed strong concerns about the amount of time available during the school day for "advising" and about the

nature of the advisory task which involved dealing with discipline problems caused by their advisees. Time and training activities had not anticipated the extent of controversy and therefore had not been designed to process deep-seated personal concerns. In addition, satisfying advisee needs and using Guidance Department support were at this point strictly theoretical tasks. Training could not address "management" or "consequence" concerns until teachers were able to establish relationships with real students and confront real problems. Therefore, these tasks understandably did not elicit respondents' changes of attitudes in a positive direction.

Task Area 17, "Working with administrators on problems or concerns," had been allotted a considerable amount of time in administrator-designed "faculty briefing sessions" which took place on eight of the ten program days. However, the format of each briefing session was not characterized by flexible activities or collegial problem-solving. Each session involved an administrator's presentation to the large faculty group about school facililties, organization, procedures or programs, which was followed by discussion of issues raised by the faculty. Such sessions seemed most appropriate to responding to initial stages of concern, "informational" or perhaps some "personal" concerns. During these sessions, policy decisions were largely clarified, not

created. "Management" or "Consequence" levels of concern were not dealt with collaboratively. On a few occasions, administrators interacted with faculty during other training activities. However, administrators invited to participate were often otherwise occupied with the myriad tasks associated with the impending school opening. Given local circumstances related to this staff development program, ongoing interaction which stresses problem-solving and collaboration on school problems and concerns is needed to continue to improve teachers' feelings of preparedness for and experience in Task Area 17. In addition, administrative participation in future training activities is likely to improve attitudes not only for this area but also for the other sixteen tasks. The presence and support of administrators can represent a strong message that ongoing professional growth is a key element in the total effectiveness of the new school.

Variability in Participant Attitudes Toward Task Areas (Analysis by Demographic Subgroups)

Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 display the results of a one way analysis of variance between change variables (the difference in pre- and post-mean scores) and demographic subgroups. These data are relevant to Research Question Three: Do teachers with diverse past experiences reveal different levels of attitudinal change as a result of their participation in the program? Tabulations were computed to discover

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN CHANGE AREAS AND FORMER SCHOOL ASSIGNMENT

Change Area 1

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	.08	.08	.06
Within Assignments	57	72.10	1.27	
Total	58	72.18		

Change Area 2

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	.06	.06	.05
Within Assignments	57	76.69	1.35	
Total	58	76.75		

Change Area 4

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	.57	.57	.46
Within Assignments	59	71.85	1.22	
Total	60	72.42		

Change Area 5

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	.01	.01	.007
Within Assignments	55	107.38	1.95	
Total	56	107.39		

Change Area 6

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	.02	.02	.01
Within Assignments	55	91.83	1.67	
Total	56	91.85		

Change Area 7

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	2.46	2.46	1.73
Within Assignments	58	82.28	1.41	
Total	59	84.74		

Change Area 8

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	.44	.44	.39
Within Assignments	54	59.59	1.10	
Total	55	60.03		

Change Area 9

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	4.21	4.21	2.41
Within Assignments	47	82.12	1.75	
Total	48	86.33		

TABLE 5 (cont.)

Change Area 10

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	1.25	1.25	.83
Within Assignments	53	79.31	1.50	
Total	54	80.56		

Change Area 11

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	.32	.32	.25
Within Assignments	57	73.02	1.28	
Total	58	73.34		

Change Area 12

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	1.92	1.92	1.41
Within Assignments	51	69.43	1.36	
Total	52	71.35		

Change Area 13

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	1.08	1.08	.717
Within Assignments	49	74.71	1.52	
Total	50	75.79		

Change Area 14

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	.12	.12	.093
Within Assignments	53	70.55	1.33	
Total	54	70.67		

Change Area 15

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	.63	.63	.34
Within Assignments	52	94.53	1.82	
Total	53	95.16		

Change Area 16

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	5.80	5.80	3.67
Within Assignments	50	78.86	1.58	
Total	51	84.66		

Change Area 17

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Assignments	1	1.88	1.88	1.39
Within Assignments	55	74.67	1.36	
Total	56	76.55		

TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN CHANGE AREAS AND DEGREE LEVELS

Change Area 1

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	1.76	.88	.70
Within Degree Levels	56	70.42	1.26	
Total	58	72.18		

Change Area 2

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	.95	.48	.35
Within Degree Levels	56	75.80	1.35	
Total	58	76.75		

Change Area 5

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	2.57	1.28	.66
Within Degree Levels	54	104.82	1.94	
Total	56	107.39		

Change Area 6

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	1.84	.92	.55
Within Degree Levels	54	90.01	1.67	
Total	56	91.85		

Change Area 7

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	9.11	4.55	3.43*
Within Degree Levels	57	75.63	1.33	
Total	59	84.74		

Change Area 8

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	.66	.33	.29
Within Degree Levels	53	59.37	1.12	
Total	55	60.03		

Change Area 9

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	1.41	.71	.38
Within Degree Levels	46	84.93	1.85	
Total	48	86.34		

*statistically significant at the .05 level

TABLE 6 (cont.)

Change Area 10

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	2.19	1.10	.73
Within Degree Levels	52	78.37	1.51	
Total	54	80.56		

Change Area 11

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	2.15	1.08	.85
Within Degree Levels	56	71.19	1.27	
Total	58	73.34		

Change Area 12

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	.92	.46	.33
Within Degree Levels	50	70.44	1.41	
Total	52	71.36		

Change Area 13

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	3.76	1.88	1.25
Within Degree Levels	48	72.04	1.50	
Total	50	75.80		

Change Area 14

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	3.34	1.67	1.29
Within Degree Levels	52	67.34	1.29	
Total	54	70.68		

Change Area 15

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	2.40	1.20	.66
Within Degree Levels	51	92.75	1.82	
Total	53	95.15		

Change Area 16

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	6.53	3.26	2.05
Within Degree Levels	49	78.13	1.59	
Total	51	84.66		

Change Area 17

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Degree Levels	2	.01	.01	.004
Within Degree Levels	54	76.54	1.42	
Total	56	76.55		

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN CHANGE AREAS AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Change Area 1

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	3.70	.93	.73
Within Yrs. of Exper.	54	68.48	1.27	
Total	58	72.18		

Change Area 2

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	2.80	.70	.51
Within Yrs. of Exper.	54	73.96	;/38	
Total	58	76.96		

Change Area 4

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	3.96	.99	.81
Within Yrs. of Exper.	56	168.45	1.22	
Total	60	172.41		

Change Area 5

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	8.94	2.23	1.18
Within Yrs. of Exper.	52	98.45	1.89	
Total	56	107.39		

Change Area 6

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	6.88	1.72	1.05
Within Yrs. of Exper.	52	84.97	1.63	
Total	56	91.85		

Change Area 7

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	1.94	.48	.32
Within Yrs. of Exper.	55	82.79	1.51	
Total	59	84.73		

Change Area 8

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	2.38	.60	.53
Within Yrs. of Exper.	51	57.64	1.13	
Total	55	60.02		

TABLE 7 (cont.)

Change Area 9

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	8.72	2.18	1.24
Within Yrs. of Exper.	44	77.62	1.76	
Total	48	86.34		

Change Area 10

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	7.41	1.85	1.27
Within Yrs. of Exper.	50	73.16	1.46	
Total	54	80.57		

Change Area 11

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	4.12	1.03	.80
Within Yrs. of Exper.	54	69.23	1.28	
Total	58	73.35		

Change Area 12

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	2.65	.66	.46
Within Yrs. of Exper.	48	68.70	1.43	
Total	52	71.35		

Change Area 13

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	4.47	1.12	.72
Within Yrs. of Exper.	46	71.32	1.55	
Total	50	75.79		

Change Area 15

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	7.33	1.83	1.02
Within Yrs. of Exper.	49	87.82	1.79	
Total	53	95.15		

Change Area 16

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	3.85	.96	.56
Within Yrs. of Exper.	47	80.81	1.72	
Total	51	84.66		

Change Area 17

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Yrs. of Exper.	4	2.89	.72	.51
Within Yrs. of Exper.	52	73.66	1.42	
Total	56	76.55		

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN CHANGE AREAS AND DEPARTMENTS

Change Area 1

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	11.62	1.16	.92
Within Departments	48	60.56	1.26	
Total	58	72.18		

Change Area 3

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	21.71	2.17	1.27
Within Departments	55	93.88	1.71	
Total	65	115.59		

Change Area 5

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	18.89	1.89	.98
Within Departments	46	88.50	1.92	
Total	56	107.39		

Change Area 6

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	13.57	1.36	1.17
Within Departments	46	73.28	1.59	
Total	56	91.85		

Change Area 9

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	12.10	1.21	.62
Within Departments	38	74.23	1.95	
Total	48	86.33		

Change Area 10

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	10.37	1.04	.65
Within Departments	44	70.19	1.60	
Total	54	80.56		

Change Area 11

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	4.92	.49	.35
Within Departments	48	68.42	1.43	
Total	58	73.34		

Change Area 12

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	4.21	4.21	2.41
Within Departments	42	60.34	1.44	
Total	52	71.36		

Change Area 16

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	12.69	1.27	.72
Within Departments	41	71.97	1.76	
Total	51	84.66		

Change Area 17

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	11.65	1.16	.82
Within Departments	46	64.90	1.41	
Total	56	76.55		

statistically significant differences in attitudinal change toward tasks among respondents who came from City High School or other Centre City Schools (Table 5), who had earned a B.A., M.A. or C.A.G.S. degree (Table 6), who had various amounts of teaching experience (Table 7) or who taught in different departments (Table 8). Data in these tables display the results of the Duncan multiple range test and a one way analysis of variance for change variables. Those change variables which were categorized into more than one subset as a result of the Duncan procedure were eliminated from the analysis of variance and are not displayed in the following tables.

An examination of Tables 5, 7 and 8 reveals that no task area reflects any statistically significant differences in amounts of attitudinal change between groups representing different former school assignments, varying amounts of teaching experience or different department affiliations. In Table 6, statistically significant variability among groups representing different degree levels exists in one area, Task (7) Creating a positive learning experience for my students in this school setting. The mean scores of changes in attitudes within these groups were:

B.A.	M.A.	C.A.G.S.
-.067	+.138	+1.05

These figures indicate that individuals with C.A.G.S. degrees reported considerably more change than the other two

groups. As Table 1 (Display of Demographic Data) shows, teachers with C.A.G.S. degrees were all City High School teachers (who had earned degrees through a federally-funded teacher-training program based at City High School). Therefore, this group possessed two positive advantages which may have affected the extent of their positive attitudinal change toward creating a positive learning experience for their students. First, it is possible that prior training in a C.A.G.S. program had helped them to better understand their students at City High School. Thus, they might have been better able to utilize the activities in a two-week staff development program to further their ability to create positive learning for their students. Second, since the new student population comprised over 50 percent of former City High School students, the former City High School teachers may have felt more positively about applying the learnings of a staff development program to the needs of students with whom they had previously worked. The combination of prior training and familiarity with student needs may have accounted for the statistically significant differences in attitudinal changes among the three degree level groups.

The general finding revealed by an examination of all other change variables in Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 is most interesting. With one exception described above, no statistically significant differences in attitudinal changes

regarding the seventeen task areas can be found between program participants from different schools, earning different degree levels, having a broad spectrum of years of teaching experience and representing many different curricular areas. Thus, differentiated and flexible training activities which focused on important concerns identified by potential participants and linked to a general effort of preparation for a new school had a similar effect upon a very diverse group of participants.

Key Ingredients for Effective Staff Development

Answers to Research Question Four, "What kinds of staff development activities are most effective in positively changing teacher attitudes?" have been interspersed in previous discussions examining data displayed in this chapter. This chapter will conclude by focusing upon the key ingredients for effective staff development which have emerged from an analysis of this local context and will, in addition, utilize participants' responses to open-ended questions in the pre- and post-treatment questionnaires to provide further insights. The following open-ended question was included in the pre-treatment questionnaire: "The three things I would like this workshop to accomplish are:" The following open-ended questions were included in the post-treatment questionnaire: "The three things I liked most

about this workshop were:", "The three things I liked least about this workshop were:", and "The things we should have covered, but didn't, were:"

An important first step for staff development programs, stressed by research and illustrated in this study of a local staff development program, is collaborative planning and implementation of training activities that involves a broadly representative group of potential participants. The belief, cited by Smith (1975) that the extra time and effort given to planning "pays off" in a "feeling of enthusiasm" (p. 37) is reinforced in this study. Questionnaire data reveal the high rating of importance given to tasks that became the focus of this program, a rating expressed by participants as a total group (Table 2) as well as by diverse demographic subgroups (Table 3).

Secondly, the benefits of participative planning in this local situation are well-illustrated by respondents' answers to the open-ended question on the pre-treatment questionnaire. A compilation of responses to the question, "The three things I would like this workshop to accomplish" reveals that individuals overwhelmingly cited tasks which were given major focus in the program, namely, "familiarity and comfort with the physical plant" in general and "the instructional pods" in particular, "development and understanding of rules and operating procedures of the school,"

and "effective communication with colleagues" especially for "coordination of programs" and "readiness of instructional materials and equipment in flexible space." Such statements, repeatedly cited by participants at the very beginning of the program, confirmed that individuals were embarking upon projects which they described as personally important to them.

A second important learning, culled from a review of the literature and illustrated by the experiences in this local program, is a logical consequence of collaborative planning. Planning Committee members determined on the basis of communicating with participants that flexible and differentiated training activities were crucially important for the program's success. Lawrence's (1974) review of ninety-seven inservice studies which emphasizes the importance of "differentiated training experiences for different teachers" that "encourage individuals to choose goals and activities for themselves" and that allow teachers to "share and provide mutual assistance to each other" (pp. 14-15) points toward those training activities in our local program which encouraged statistically significant positive attitudinal change. These particular activities gave teachers the opportunity to learn new information, to apply learnings with their colleagues in a variety of self-defined and concrete ways and to share the products of their collaborative

work. Conversely, those activities which lacked these ingredients produced statistically insignificant change.

The effectiveness of the more differentiated training which supported teachers in designing their space, developing rules and procedures and creating a comfortable instructional environment for their students in flexible space is described in participants' answers to open-ended questions in the post-questionnaire. In response to the question, "the three things I liked best about this workshop . . . ," a majority (sixty-two) of respondents mentioned the many opportunities they had to "become familiar with building facilities" and "pod design," and "to become acquainted with fellow faculty members and colleagues in my department" who could "be resources and friends." Another common response (from fifty-six teachers) involved "the amount of work time in the pods" reserved for "interdepartmental sharing" and "working with colleagues to plan strategies," "arrange materials and equipment," "discuss common pod problems," and "exchange ideas."

Many additional ideas about training activities emerge from the negative findings in this local program. A major learning, issuing primarily from data in those task activities that did not result in significant positive attitudinal change is that training takes time, time to process information and to address personal and management concerns,

time that may not be available during a single program. A common problem often resulting from broad-based collaborative planning is the frequent identification of a multitude of high-priority concerns and the natural desire to respond to all pressing needs at once. Attempts to satisfy this desire can inadvertently program participants for failure. Planning for success requires, first, a concerted effort to narrow priorities and define goals that are achievable in a particular time period, given local circumstances, and second, a long-term view featuring ongoing support that addresses needs as they arise and as they change. Although myriad concerns were expressed by teachers preparing for their new school, the planning committee could not design a program to resolve them all before school opened and teachers knew from experience what they needed to know. Participants' responses to the second open-ended question in the post- questionnaire expressed this reality. When asked to complete the statement, "The three things I liked least about this workshop," fifteen teachers wrote that they needed "more time to cover everything," "time to do department business" and "pod work," "time to work with new materials and books."

A second insight related to effective training activities involves the use of local resource people. Respondents' positive reactions to colleagues who functioned as

presenters were expressed in their answers to the questions about "what they liked most." Many (twenty-nine) teachers responded by citing "the variety of excellent facilitators," "the expertise of the resource people" and the "good preparation by leaders." These answers reflect the belief of Rand researchers McLaughlin and March (1978) that "teachers often represent the best clinical expertise available" (p. 87). However, the practical experiences related to this program remind us that local resource people also need support and ongoing training. Giving close attention to the preparation and skills of individuals selected as group leaders as well as the dynamics of each working group must be stressed. Despite the most stellar program design, human factors are crucial determinants of success or failure. As three respondents to the question about "things liked least" pointed out, participants and group leaders may need training to deal positively with those who exhibit "reluctance to think positively" or "refusal of some to share and cooperate" or "a tendency to criticize and tear down and not to build." As McLaughlin (1978) reminds us, "The problem of reform or change is more a function of people and organizations than of technology" (p. 69).

Perhaps the most important learning derived from a two-week staff development program executed within local parameters is that professional development is an ongoing

process which single-shot programs, held for one day or for two weeks, cannot accomplish alone. Schools and school systems need to develop new and creative ways to provide ongoing school-specific support for their professionals who daily face complex instructional problems and who grapple with numerous levels of concern each time they confront change. Teachers who seek to better meet the needs of a diverse student population which reflects all of society's problems can be encouraged through effective teacher advisors (Manolakes, 1977), ongoing curriculum creation (Mann, 1975) and varied staff support activities (McLaughlin and March, 1978). Such responses need to be woven into the fabric of daily school interactions and learning activities. This fabric, reinforced and strengthened by the threads of administrative support for and participation in training, can far better withstand today's societal pressures as it is pulled and pushed by the forces of public disaffection, legislative mandates, accountability and economic constraints.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study has discussed the relationship of current research findings about effective teacher training to an examination of a local collaboratively-planned and executed staff development program. It has analyzed the effects of this program by measuring changes in participants' attitudes toward seventeen tasks which became the focus of training activities. Data collected were used to determine what principles of effective staff development found in the research clearly applied to this local context and what additional conclusions could be drawn from a study of one school faculty preparing for complex change within the idiosyncracies of a particular environment.

This chapter contains a discussion of the implications for staff development which result from a comparison of present staff development theory and actual practice in a local program. The chapter will address Research Question Five: What new conceptualizations for future staff development practice and research emerge from this study?

Providing school personnel with the support and encouragement to continue to be active learners requires some

powerful new strategies in staff development. These strategies must be built upon a strong foundation, a base that incorporates an understanding of the many factors (teachers' prior experiences, past inadequate training and the day-to-day vicissitudes of the job) militating against change as well as the need for staff developers to respond to these factors in a variety of flexible, differentiated ways.

Implications for Staff Development

As we view one local program in retrospect, certain key learnings emerge. Future staff development programs designed for a school faculty facing complex change, based upon the findings of this study, will increase their effectiveness if they concentrate upon incorporating the following elements into their program design.

Collaborative planning. Counteracting teachers' possible resistance to staff development activities requires first that they become involved from the very beginning in identifying their own concerns and needs for instruction and in helping to design appropriate ways to address these concerns. Data in this study indicate, as Bunker (1979) expresses, "Shared decision making increases learner involvement" (p. 2). Individuals most involved in the planning and implementation of staff development activities in the City Community High School program as well as the

constituencies they represented, the participants in this program, overwhelmingly gave the program foci very high ratings of importance. Such findings indicate that City Community High School faculty concerns, as represented by their planning committee, were included in the program design.

A second learning derived from an examination of the total program, however, is the need for training of participant-planners. Broad-based collaboration in the design of a training program, as was illustrated by the City High School planning and implementation process, can result in the identification of myriad concerns and complex issues which planners feel compelled to address all at once. As they work with teachers, staff developers can add a valuable perspective by stressing that training is an ongoing, developmental process. Such a process cannot take place during a single program; consequently, any program held for one day or two weeks is one component in a long range of ongoing activities that allow participants the time to grow. Planning is facilitated when groups learn to prioritize and refine their goals, arriving at those which are realistic and achievable, given the local situation. Most importantly, beginning with this long-range perspective truly fosters acceptance on the part of participants that collaborative planning, like professional growth, is continuous.

Differentiated training activities. Analysis of this local program strongly reinforced the principle that flexible training which encourages students to be self-initiating, active learners is equally as important for teachers. As data in this study indicate, teachers' positive attitudes toward new tasks were enhanced by those training activities (focusing especially on space design) that encouraged teachers to learn in an active way, working with new information about the relationship of the environment to their instruction, interacting with new ideas in their department pods, applying new skills, helping each other and sharing the designs and procedures developed by their work. Such activities, akin to a reinvention of the wheel, result in what Rand researchers call a "mutual adaptation" of a new instructional environment and new tasks to individual teaching and learning styles. They encourage the "sustained and empirical practice-orientd inquiry into problems and alternatives" stressed by Lortie (1975, p. 69).

In contrast, task areas receiving training characterized by single-shot introductions to new tasks in this program resulted in insignificant attitudinal change. Many of these training activities were designed in an effort to "cover" the myriad high-priority concerns identified by a diverse faculty opening a new school. Given the many unanswered questions associated with a new building, new

materials, new students and new colleagues, the design of some introductory sessions, responsive at the "informational" level of concern, was understandable and perhaps most appropriate. The potential problem with such staff development sessions arises if there is a lack of follow-up during the school year. Successful implementation of new practices can only occur when individuals have the opportunity to grapple with many levels of concern and many issues (time demands, management of new techniques, the effects of new strategies on students, and possibilities for collaboration about new techniques).

Ongoing staff development support. The effectiveness of a staff development program is enhanced when it is viewed as one link in a long chain of ongoing events. The tendency to try to cover a number of complex issues in a short period of time inevitably becomes reinforced in school-site staff development programs by the lack of time available during the school day and school year to address professional issues. The Centre City school system, like many others, schedules separate professional days during the year. This system allocates three days each year which occur in the Fall, Winter and Spring, for staff development activities. Although releasing teachers to concentrate on professional concerns reveals a commitment to staff development on the part of the school system, teachers usually attend systemwide workshops

designed according to subject area and grade. Thus, personnel of a particular school seldom work together. Reliance upon staff development designed in this way inadvertently encourages superficial treatment of curricular and instructional concerns. Teachers return to their school site having had a variety of different experiences. If no provisions are then made for follow-up, for ongoing application of learnings at the school site, potential for growth is minimized, given other influences daily affecting teachers in the schools. Without ongoing support, the strong tendencies described by Liebermann and Miller (1978, pp. 59-61) for teachers to "cope" during the school day by being "practical" and "realistic" (making do rather than trying new idealistic ideas) and being "private" (not sharing professional concerns with colleagues) are likely to prevail and therefore to minimize ongoing professional development.

Two training strategies which can reinforce single-day training provided in the Centre City schools might be introduced in this school system. First, master teachers who have had daily experience in elementary and secondary schools might be released from teaching in order to function as "teacher advisors." These roles are effectively described by Manolakes (1977) and Thomas (1979). Advisors can extend the learnings of a single training session and respond to needs as they arise by encouraging ongoing

curriculm development, the strategy which Smith (1975), Mann (1975) and Berman (1975) all cite as a powerful staff development technique. As Bunker (1977) succinctly expresses, "People learn to do what they do" (p. 33).

A second means for providing daily staff support involves the creation of a school-site resource center facilitated by teacher advisors as well as school staff and interested community members. The center could be a new environment in a school that is not a classroom, office or lounge, and that was designed expressly for the sharing of professional concerns. Within such an innovative school environment, teachers might be encouraged to play new roles if they are supported by school administrators, the "gate keepers of change" who signal the "legitimacy" of teachers' efforts (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978, pp. 30-31). During preparation periods and after school, personnel can meet to develop solutions to students' instructional problems. Special programs that bring community and university resources into the school and that address each school's unique needs can be designed and sponsored by participants at the resource center. Commercial and teacher or student-made materials can be displayed and made available to spark new ideas. Such resources in a center serving as a locus for staff development activities can help to foster new relationships among teachers, administrators and community

members. Informal groupings that develop may then result in a "critical mass" of individuals who together establish a norm for change within the culture of their school.

At City Community High School, those department heads and department leaders who served as facilitators during department work sessions and subject area workshops could be encouraged to use their experience by applying the same principles of collaborative planning and implementation to programs in their school center, programs that build upon skills developed in the summer program. As Bunker (1977) says, "Readiness for growth is built upon people's strengths" (p. 33). Each of these possible strategies focuses on strengthening continuous school-site staff development because "staff cannot perceive what they need to know until the need arises" (McLaughlin and March, 1978, p. 78).

Conclusions

Based upon the findings in pre- and post-treatment questionnaires, we can conclude that the professional staff at City Community High School will benefit from the opportunity to build on learnings in the summer program and to focus on tasks which they collaboratively identified as high priority concerns, especially those tasks which did not reveal significant positive attitudinal change. Needs in these task areas, as well as higher levels of concern in

other task areas, will surface more clearly once teachers have the opportunity to perform tasks in a reality-based situation. Thus, the most important areas of focus for ongoing support at City Community High School seemed to be ongoing curriculum development, teachers' roles in the advisor-advisee program and teacher/administator collaborative problem-solving. In addition, although some positive attitudinal change took place, additional support was warranted in tasks involving helping students with reading comprehension, mainstreaming special needs students, using instructional media and meeting the needs of community members. Ongoing support in the these areas could incorporate strategies discussed above (collaborative planning and differentiated training for active learning) not only during professional development days that emphasize on-site activities but also during the regular school day from teacher advisors and the development of an on-site resource center.

Moreover, in order to strengthen the school staff's ability to be self-sustaining, training in process rather than product should be given central focus. First of all, training in planning processes for administrators and department leaders that covers skills in needs assessment as well as prioritiziing, refining and concretizing realistic goals can help them to identify and deal with needs as they arise and consequently can encourage proactive rather than

reactive responses to problems. Second, training in facilitating group activities, in encouraging participants to actively interact with new ideas and materials, might significantly affect future faculty meetings, department meetings and resource center programs and may, in time, result in greater use of the same strategies with students. Third, the active participation of principals and assistant principals in all on-site professional activities will strengthen their roles as "instructional leaders" and will serve as a strong message to teachers that staff development is an important priority in their school.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study was undertaken in order to extend our understanding of effective staff development processes and practices in one local context. Focus was given to a two-week training program collaboratively designed and executed by potential participants preparing to teach in a new flexible-space community high school. Because this training experience is one step in an ongoing process of professional development, rich possibilities for future research exist in this and other school settings. The following areas of study related to school-site staff development are suggested for future research:

- An examination of the role of teacher advisors in extending the training teachers receive in courses or workshops presented during system-wide staff development days. How can advisors help teachers to apply and adapt learnings to their own teaching styles and their students' learning needs? What specific problems emerge from various contextual situations and how can advisors deal with them? What training and support do advisors need in order to function effectively?
- A case study of the planning, development and evaluation of an on-site resource center for teachers, administrators and parents. What kinds of school environments encourage teachers to play new professional roles? What special resources and activities can be created to respond to different school settings in order to foster collegial sharing, problem-solving and professional renewal?
- A study of flexible school schedules and new patterns of teaching assignments which integrate professional training into the regularities of a school day. How can team teaching, use of student tutors, teacher aides and paraprofessionals be utilized to enable school professionals to concentrate on staff development activities in an ongoing way?
- An investigation of new professional incentives and rewards (intrinsic and extrinsic) which could be introduced

to encourage teachers to engage in self-initiated professional development. What roles can administrators, parents or university personnel play to give recognition and support to teachers' educational achievements?

- What methods are most effective in fostering ongoing teacher-administrator collaborative planning for school improvement? What training in planning processes and in methods for assessing needs and prioritizing goals do school personnel need to plan proactively rather than reactively to emerging student needs?

Educators and parents unanimously affirm the crucially important role that teachers in elementary and secondary schools play in training our future generations. As we face the challenge of providing students with "cope-ability" skills in a rapidly changing world, we must strive to provide teachers, the ultimate implementers of instructional change, with appropriate mechanisms for their own continuous growth and development. Focusing on the environment in which teachers spend most of their time, the school site, and developing an atmosphere in these schools that fosters, encourages and rewards a process of self-initiated learning, continues to be a present and future challenge for staff developers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Robert H. 1978. "The Individualization of Learning: Teacher Related Problems." The In-Service Education of Teachers, Louis Rubin, ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Aquino, John T. and Hopkins, Davies. 1975. "Collaboration in Continuing Professional Development." Journal of Teacher Education. XXVI: 274-277.

Bentzen, Mary M. 1974. Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Berman, Paul and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. 1978. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations, Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Berman, Paul et al. 1977. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VII: Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

_____. 1975. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV: The Findings in Review. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Blue, Robert A. 1971. "Humanizing Teacher Education," as cited in Combs, A. W. (1974) The Professional Education of Teachers: A Humanistic Approach to Teacher Preparation. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Broudy, H. S. "In-Service Teacher Education--Paradoxes and Potentials." The In-Service Education of Teachers, Louis Rubin, ed. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Bunker, R. Mason. 1977. "Beyond In-Service--Toward Staff Renewal." Journal of Teacher Education. XXVIII (2): 31-34.

_____. 1979. "Staff Renewal in an Urban Junior High School." Middle School Journal. X (4): 18 ff.

_____. 1980. "Developing a Network of Secondary Teachers Through a Teacher Center." Journal of Staff Development. I (1): 76-87.

_____. 1980. "Helping Staff Development Groups to Self Direct." Inservice. April 1980: 12 ff.

Culver, Carmen M. and Gary J. Hoban, Eds. 1973. The Power to Change: Issues for Innovative Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Dyer, Jean Roger. 1979. Understanding and Evaluating Educational Research. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Edelfelt, Roy A. 1978. Inservice Education: Demonstrating Local Programs. Bellingham, Wash.: Western Washington University.

_____. 1977. Inservice Education: Criteria for and Examples of Local Programs. Bellingham, Wash.: Western Washington State College.

Edelfelt, Roy A. and Margo Johnson, Eds. 1975. Rethinking Inservice Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Fitz-Gibbon, Carol Taylor and Morris, Lynn Lyons. 1978. How to Design a Program Evaluation. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Fuller, F. F. 1969. "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization." American Educational Research Journal. VI (2): 207-226.

Goddu, Roland, Jeannie Crosly and Sara Massey. 1977. "Inservice: The Professional development of Educators." Journal of Teacher Education. XXVIII (2): 24-30.

Goodlad, John I. 1975. The Dynamics of Educational Change: Toward Responsive Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill

Hall, Gene E. and Susan Loucks. 1978. "Teacher Concerns as a Basis for Facilitating and Personalizing Staff Development." Teachers College Record. LXXX: 36-53.

Henerson, Marlene E., Lynn Lyons Morris and Carol Fitz-Gibbon. 1978. How to Measure Attitudes. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Hermanowicz, H. J. 1966. "The Pluralistic World of Beginning Teachers." The Real World of the Beginning Teacher. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Jackson, Philip W. 1968. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Jeffers, Stanley H. and Dolores McDaniels. 1975. "Building a Preservice-Inservice Teacher Continuum: The Washington Experience." Rethinking Inservice Education. R. A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, Eds. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Joyce, Bruce and Beverly Showers. 1980. "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research." Educational Leadership. XXXIV (5): 379-385.

Ladd, Edward T. 1966. "Interpretation and Perspectives." The Real World of the Beginning Teacher. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Lawrence, Gordon. 1974. Patterns of Effective Inservice Education. Tallahassee, Fla.: Florida Educational Research & Development Program.

Leiter, Maurice and Myrna Cooper. "How Teacher Unionists View Inservice Education." Teachers College Record. LXXX: 69-94.

Lieberman, Ann and Lynne Miller. 1978. "The Social Realities of Teaching." Teachers College Record. LXXX: 54-68.

Lortie, Dan C. 1975. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1969. "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching." The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. Etzioni, A., Ed. New York: Free Press.

Loucks, Susan F. and Gene E. Hall. 1977. "Assessing and Facilitating the Implementation of Innovations." Educational Technology. XVII (2): 18-21

Manolakes, Theodore. 1977. "The Advisory System and Supervision." Essays on Teachers' Centers. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin and David Marsh. 1978. "Staff Development and Social Change." Teachers College Record. LXXX: 69-94.

McPherson, Gertrude. 1972. Small Town Teacher. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mann, Dale. 1976. "The Politics of Training Teachers in Schools." Teachers College Record. LXXVII: 323-338.

_____. 1975. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.

Oppenheim, A. N. 1966. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books Inc. Publishers.

Orlich, Donald C. Guide to Sensible Surveys. 1975. Olympia, Washington: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, E D 112 017.

Orrange, P. A. and Michael Van Ryn. 1975. "Agency Roles and Responsibilities in Inservice Education." Rethinking Inservice Education. R. A. Edelfelt, Ed. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Pilcher, Paul. 1975. "Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here?" Supporting the Learning Teacher. Marilyn Hapgood, Ed. New York: Agathon Press.

Popham, W. James. 1974. Evaluation in Education: Current Applications. Beverly, California: McCutcheon Publishing Corp.

Richey, H. G. 1957. "Growth of the Modern Conception of Inservice Education for Teachers, Supervisors and Administrators." Fifty-Sixth Yearbook. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Rosenthal, Robert and Lenore Jacobson. 1968. Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupils' Intellectual Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Rubin, Louis J., Ed. 1978. The Inservice Education of Teachers: Trends, Processes and Prescriptions. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

_____. 1971. Improving Inservice Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sarason, Seymour B. 1971. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sax, Gilbert. 1979. Foundations of Educational Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Schiffer, Judith. 1978. "A Framework for Staff Development." Teachers College Record. LXXX: 4-22.

Silberman, Charles E. 1979. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House.

Smith, E. Brooks. 1975. "Improvement of Inservice Education: A Collaborative Effort." Rethinking Inservice Education. R. A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, Eds. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Smith, H. W. 1975. Strategies of Social Research: The Methodological Imagination. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Smith, Louis M. and Pat M. Keith. 1971. Anatomy of Educational Innovation. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Smith, Louis M. and William Geoffrey. 1968. Complexities of an Urban Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Thomas, Gretchen. 1979. The Advisor: Emissary from Teachers' Center to Classroom. (Occasional Paper No. 6). San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Tyler, Ralph W. 1971. "Inservice Education of Teachers: A Look at the Past and Future." Improving Inservice Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change. L. J. Rubin, Ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Weiss, Carol H. 1972. Evaluation Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Wiersma, William. 1969. Research Methods in Education. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

Williams, Richard C. 1978. "A Political Perspective on Staff Development." Teachers College Record. LXXX: 95-106.

APPENDIX A

Pre-Treatment Questionnaire

CITY COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

Your department _____ Years of Teaching Experience _____

Highest degree held _____ Personal I.D. number _____

Check one: ____ former City High faculty __ new City High faculty

****

DIRECTIONS: The items below deal with teachers' tasks at City Community High School. Please circle one number in each row that best expresses your feelings about each task. If any item does not apply in any way to your role as teacher, leave it blank.

1) Working with department members to design the space in our department pod.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

2) Working with department members to formulate department rules and procedures for student behavior.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

3) Developing new ways to orient students to their environment.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

4) Determining methods for controlling student and teacher noise.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

5) Sharing learning stations with other teachers in a pod.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

6) Working with department members to solve problems of teaching in flexible space.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

7) Creating a positive learning experience for my students in this school setting.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

8) Teaching new department curricula.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

9) Helping studnets with reading comprehension problems.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

10) Mainscreaming special needs students in my classes.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

11) Using new department equipment and/or materials.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

12) Using educational television and other media in my teaching.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

13) Meeting the needs of my student advisees.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

14) Utilizing Guidance Department services and resources.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

15) Adjusting to the flexible schedule.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

16) Meeting community needs during and after school.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

17) Working with administrators on school problems or concerns.

(I am)	experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced
	unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared
	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive
(The task is)	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

****

18) The three things I would like this workshop to accomplish are:

1. _____

_____

2. _____

_____

3. _____

_____

THANKS FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

APPENDIX B

Post-Treatment Questionnaire

CITY COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

Your department _____ Years of Teaching Experience _____

Highest degree held _____ Personal I.D. number _____

Check one: ____ former City High faculty __ new City High faculty

---

DIRECTIONS: The items below deal with teachers' tasks at City Community High School. Please circle one number in each row that best describes your feelings about each task. If any item does not apply in any way to your role as teacher, leave it blank.

1. Working with department members to design the space in our department pod.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

---

2. Working with department members to formulate department rules and procedures for student behavior.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

---

3. Developing ways to orient students to their environment.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

---

4. Determining methods for controlling student and teacher noise.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

---

5. Sharing learning stations with other teachers in a pod.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

---

6. Working with department members to solve problems of teaching in flexible space.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

---

7. Creating a positive learning experience for my students in this school setting.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

8. Teaching new department curricula.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

9. Helping students with reading comprehension problems.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

10. Mainstreaming special needs students in my classes.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

11. Using new department equipment and/or materials.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

12. Using educational television and other media in my teaching.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

13. Meeting the needs of my student advisees.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

14. Utilizing Guidance Department services and resources.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

15. Adjusting to the flexible schedule.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamiliar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

16. Meeting community needs during and after school.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamilar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

17. Working with administators on school problems or concerns.

(I am)								(The task is)							
experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	inexperienced	difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	easy
unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	prepared	familiar	1	2	3	4	5	6	unfamilar
enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	apprehensive	unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	important

18. The three things I liked most about this workshop were:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

19. The three things I liked least about this workshop were:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

20. The things we should have covered, but didn't, were:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

CITY COMMUNITY

HIGH SCHOOL

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

SUMMER WORKSHOP

AUGUST 7-18, 1978

MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 1978

8:00- 9:00 OPENING CEREMONIES
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Principal
Speakers: Mayor
Superintendent of Schools
9:00- 9:15 Coffee Break
9:15- 9:30 OVERVIEW OF SUMMER WORKSHOP PROGRAM
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Speaker: Supervisor of Program Development
9:30-10:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "SCHOOL DESIGN AND "GENERAL TRAFFIC FLOW"
(Lecture Hall)
Speaker: Principal
10:00-11:30 TOUR OF CITY COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL
Tour Guides: Level 1 - Assistant Principal
Level 2 - Assistant Principal
Level 3 - Assistant Principal
Upon completion of the tour, teachers will assemble in their department pods.
11:30- 1:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION: "Department Agenda"
(Department Pods)
"Department Leaders" will set each agenda and organize activities during all Department Work Sessions.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1978

8:00 -9:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "USE OF FLEXIBLE SPACE/SCHOOL RULES & REGULATIONS"
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Principal
9:00- 9:15 Coffee Break
9:15-10:00 GENERAL SESSION: "GUIDELINES FOR SPACE DESIGN, NOISE CONTROL & TRAFFIC FLOW"
Lecture Hall
Presiding: Program Coordinator
Speakers: City Community High School staff members
10:00- 1:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION
(Department Pods)
Faculty in each department will meet in pods to plan student traffic patterns and noise control and to set up learning stations (placement of furniture, display and storage areas).
12:30- 1:00 DEPARTMENT LEADERS MEETING: "ADMINISTRATORS WILL MEET WITH DEPARTMENT LEADERS REGARDING POD DESIGN"
(Principal's Conference Room-Level II)

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1978

8:00- 8:45 GENERAL SESSION: "GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT ORIENTATION, DISCIPLINE AND TEACHER COORDINATION IN FLEXIBLE SPACE"
(Lecture Hall - Level II)
Presiding: Program Coordinator
Speakers: City Community High School staff
8:45- 9:00 Coffee Break
9:00-11:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION
(Department Pods)
Faculty in each department will meet in pods to formulate department rules for student behavior, strategies for student orientation and teacher coordination.
11:00-12:00 GENERAL FEEDBACK SESSION
(Lecture Hall)
A representative from each department will give a five-minute presentation describing their pod design, department rules and plans for noise control and teacher cooperation.
12:00- 1:00 FACULTY DE-BRIEFING
(Lecture Hall)
Presiding: Principal
Administrators will respond to pertinent questions and concerns.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 1980

8:00-10:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION: "DEPARTMENT AGENDA"
(Department Pods)
Presiding: Department Leaders
10:00-11:30 GENERAL SESSION: "PANEL ON SCHOOL-COMMUNITY COOPERATION"
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Principal
Speakers: Dept. of Parks & Rec. Director
Neighborhood Center Director
Assistant Principal (Parent Council Rep.)
11:30- 1:00 BUS TOUR OF COMMUNITY
Tour Guides: Principal & Asst. Principals

FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 1980

8:00-12:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION: "INVENTORY STORAGE AND MATERIAL DISTRIBUTION""
(Department Pods)
Presiding: Department Leaders
12:00- 1:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND PRINCIPAL'S AGENDA"
(Lecture Hall)
Presiding: Principal & Asst. Principals

MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 1980

8:00- 8:45 GENERAL SESSION: "KEY ISSUES IN PREPARING FOR A FLEXIBLE-SPACE COMMUNITY SCHOOL"
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Assistant Principal
Speaker: Dean of Education, Central University

8:45- 9:00 Coffee Break

All departments will attend the following workshop in Groups.
"THE DEPARTMENT OF GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING: INFORMATION ABOUT THE TEACHER ADVISORY SYSTEM AND DEPARTMENT SERVICES FOR TEACHERS AND STUDENTS"
(Guidance Pod - Level II)
Leader: Head Counselor
9:00- 9:50 Group I
10:00-10:50 Group II
11:00-11:50 Group III
Teachers will spend remaining hours in Department Work Sessions with Department Leaders. The Dean of Education will meet with individual departments upon request during this time to address their concerns.

12:00- 1:00 FACULTY BRIEFING SESSION: "PRINCIPAL'S AGENDA"
Lecture Hall
Presiding: Principal & Asst. Principals

TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 1978

The following workshops will be offered three times on a rotating basis:
"MEDIA & TELEVISION PRODUCTION FACILITIES & PROGRAMS"
(T.V. Studio-Level II)
Leaders: Director of Instructional Media
Educational Television Instructor
"READING STRATEGIES FOR CONTENT AREA TEACHERS"
(Reading Pod-Level II)
Leaders: Director of Reading
Reading Department staff
"SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS IN REGULAR CLASSES: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION FOR TEACHERS"
(Special Education Pod-Level I)
Leaders: Acting Director of Special Education
Teacher: Physical Education Department
Teacher: Special Education Department
Departments will attend workshops in Groups according to the following time schedule:

Group I
8:00 "MEDIA & TELEVISION PRODUCTION"
9:00 "READING STRATEGIES"
10:00 "SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS"

Group II
8:00 "SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS"
9:00 "MEDIA & TELEVISION PRODUCTION"
10:00 "READING STRATEGIES"

Group III
8:00 "READING STRATEGIES"
9:00 "SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS
10:00 "MEDIA & TELEVISION PRODUCTION"

11:00- 4:00 FAMILY PICNIC (on school grounds)
Families of all staff members are invited to attend.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 1978

Departments designated as "Participants" will attend workshops listed below. Faculty not attending will work in their respective pods on Department Agenda developed by Department Leaders. All teachers will participate in the General Session at 11:00 a.m.

8:00- 9:00 "ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAMS AT YOUR SCHOOL: HOW TO START AND DEVELOP THEM; HOW TO GAIN PARENT & COMMUNITY INTEREST & SUPPORT
Leader: Associate Director, College Board
Participants: Department Heads

8:00-11:00 "OPERATION AND USE OF THE CITY COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL POOL"
Leaders: Pool Company Representatives
Participants: Physical Education Department

9:00-10:00 "IDEAS FOR TEAMING AND COOPERATIVE PLANNING WITHIN DEPARTMENTS"
Leader: Team Leader (English)
Participants: English Department

9:00-10:00 "THE DIGITAL COMPUTER: INFORMATION FOR TEACHERS"
Leader: Teacher, Business Dept.
Participants: Business, Math and Science Departments

9:00-10:00 "CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION"
Leader: Industrial Arts Department Leader
Participants: Industrial Arts Department

9:00-10:00 "WORKSHOP: MUSIC"
Leader: Director of Music
Participants: Music Department

10:00-11:00 "BASIC MATH SKILLS IN OTHER CONTENT AREAS"
Leader: Math Teacher
Participants: Art, Home Economics, Industrial Arts and Math Departments

11:00-12:00 "GENERAL SESSION: "THE DIFFERENTIATED SEMI-ROTATING SCHEDULE: ITS ADVANTAGES FOR TEACHERS AND STUDENTS"
Leader: Team Leader (English)

12:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "PRINCIPAL'S AGENDA
Presiding: Principal & Asst. Principals

THURSDAY, AUGUST 17, 1978

Faculty members will work on Department agenda developed by Department Leaders with the exception of the following scheduled workshops:

8:00-12:00 "THE NEW MATH ILA PROGRAM"
(Math Pod - Level III)
Leader: Development Specialist, Research for Better Schools
Participants: Math Department

8:00-12:00 "PROJECT CITY"
(Physical Education Office - Level I)
Leader: Assistant Professor, local university
Participants: Physical Education, Health & Safety Departments

9:00-10:00 "SCHOOL ADVISORY COUNCILS"
(Lecture Hall - Level II)
Leader: Teacher
Participants: Open to entire faculty

10:00-11:00 "USE OF BUSINESS EQUIPMENT"
(Business Pod - Level III)
Leader: Office supplier
Participants: Business Department

10:00-11:00 "OPERATION OF NEW INDUSTRIAL ARTS EQUIPMENT"
(Industrial Arts Pod - Level I)
Leader: Director of Industrial Arts
Participants: Industrial Arts Department members

10:00-11:00 "THE NEW ENGLISH CURRICULUM"
(English Pod - Level II)
Leader: Coordinator of English
Participants: English Department

10:00-11:00 "MUSIC DEPARTMENT WORKSHOP"
(Music Pod - Level II)
Leader: Director of Music
Participants: Music Department

12:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "PRINCIPAL'S AGENDA"
(Lecture Hall)
Presiding: Principal & Assc. Principals

FRIDAY, AUGUST 18, 1978

8:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION: "DEPARTMENT AGENDA"
(Department Pods)
Presiding: Department Leaders

11:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "OPENING DAY INFORMATION"
(Lecture Hall - Level II)
Presiding: Principal & Assc. Principals

12:30 GENERAL CLOSING SESSION
(Lecture Hall)
Speakers: Superintendent of Schools
Vice Chairman of School Committee

DEPARTMENT LEADERS

The following Department Leaders will set each agenda and organize activities during Department Work Sessions:

ART - Senior Teacher
BILINGUAL - Senior Teacher
BUSINESS - Business Department Head
ENGLISH - English Department Head
FOREIGN LANGUAGE - Foreign Language Department Head
GUIDANCE - Head Counselor
INDUSTRIAL ARTS - Senior Teacher
LIBRARY - Senior Librarian
MATHEMATICS - Math Department Head
MUSIC - Senior Teacher
PHYSICAL ED., HEALTH & SAFETY - Senior Teacher
READING - Senior Teacher
SCIENCE - Science Department Head
SOCIAL STUDIES - Social Studies Department Head
SPECIAL EDUCATION - Senior Teacher

****

DEPARTMENT GROUPINGS

Departments will attend scheduled workshops on August 14 and 15 in the following groups:

GROUP I
English
Social Studies
Foreign Languages
Bilingual
Reading

GROUP II
Science
Math
Industrial Arts
Art and Music

GROUP III
Guidance
Business
Physical Education & Health
Special Education
Library

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN CHANGE AREAS AND DEPARTMENTS

Change Area 1

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	11.62	1.16	.92
Within Departments	48	60.56	1.26	
Total	58	72.18		

Change Area 3

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	21.71	2.17	1.27
Within Departments	55	93.88	1.71	
Total	65	115.59		

Change Area 5

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	18.89	1.89	.98
Within Departments	46	88.50	1.92	
Total	56	107.39		

Change Area 6

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	18.57	1.86	1.17
Within Departments	46	73.28	1.59	
Total	56	91.85		

Change Area 9

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	12.10	1.21	.62
Within Departments	38	74.23	1.95	
Total	48	86.33		

Change Area 10

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	10.37	1.04	.65
Within Departments	44	70.19	1.60	
Total	54	80.56		

Change Area 11

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	4.92	.49	.35
Within Departments	48	68.42	1.43	
Total	58	73.34		

Change Area 12

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	4.21	4.21	2.41
Within Departments	42	60.34	1.44	
Total	52	71.36		

Change Area 16

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	12.69	1.27	.72
Within Departments	41	71.97	1.76	
Total	51	84.66		

Change Area 17

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	11.65	1.16	.82
Within Departments	46	64.90	1.41	
Total	56	76.55		

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN CHANGE AREAS AND DEPARTMENTS

Change Area 1

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	11.62	1.16	.92
Within Departments	48	60.56	1.26	
Total	58	72.18		

Change Area 3

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	21.71	2.17	1.27
Within Departments	55	93.88	1.71	
Total	65	115.59		

Change Area 5

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	18.89	1.89	.98
Within Departments	46	88.50	1.92	
Total	56	107.39		

Change Area 6

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	13.57	1.36	1.17
Within Departments	46	73.28	1.59	
Total	56	91.85		

Change Area 9

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	12.10	1.21	.62
Within Departments	38	74.23	1.95	
Total	48	86.33		

Change Area 10

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	10.37	1.04	.63
Within Departments	44	70.19	1.60	
Total	54	80.56		

Change Area 11

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	4.92	.49	.35
Within Departments	48	68.42	1.43	
Total	58	73.34		

Change Area 12

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	4.21	4.21	2.41
Within Departments	42	60.34	1.44	
Total	52	71.36		

Change Area 16

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	12.69	1.27	.72
Within Departments	41	71.97	1.76	
Total	51	84.66		

Change Area 17

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Departments	10	11.65	1.16	.82
Within Departments	46	64.90	1.41	
Total	56	76.55		

MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 1978

8:00- 9:00 OPENING CEREMONIES
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Principal
Speakers: Mayor
Superintendent of Schools
9:00- 9:15 Coffee Break
9:15- 9:30 OVERVIEW OF SUMMER WORKSHOP PROGRAM
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Speaker: Supervisor of Program Development
9:30-10:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "SCHOOL DESIGN AND "GENERAL TRAFFIC FLOW"
(Lecture Hall)
Speaker: Principal
10:00-11:30 TOUR OF CITY COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL
Tour Guides: Level 1 - Assistant Principal
Level 2 - Assistant Principal
Level 3 - Assistant Principal
Upon completion of the tour, teachers will assemble in their department pods.
11:30- 1:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION: "Department Agenda"
(Department Pods)
"Department Leaders" will set each agenda and organize activities during all Department Work Sessions.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1978

8:00 -9:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "USE OF FLEXIBLE SPACE/SCHOOL RULES & REGULATIONS"
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Principal
9:00- 9:15 Coffee Break
9:15-10:00 GENERAL SESSION: "GUIDELINES FOR SPACE DESIGN, NOISE CONTROL & TRAFFIC FLOW"
Lecture Hall
Presiding: Program Coordinator
Speakers: City Community High School staff members
10:00- 1:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION
(Department Pods)
Faculty in each department will meet in pods to plan student traffic patterns and noise control and to set up learning stations (placement of furniture, display and storage areas).
12:30- 1:00 DEPARTMENT LEADERS MEETING: "ADMINISTRATORS WILL MEET WITH DEPARTMENT LEADERS REGARDING POD DESIGN"
(Principal's Conference Room-Level II)

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1978

8:00- 8:45 GENERAL SESSION: "GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT ORIENTATION, DISCIPLINE AND TEACHER COORDINATION IN FLEXIBLE SPACE"
(Lecture Hall - Level II)
Presiding: Program Coordinator
Speakers: City Community High School staff
8:45- 9:00 Coffee Break
9:00-11:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION
(Department Pods)
Faculty in each department will meet in pods to formulate department rules for student behavior, strategies for student orientation and teacher coordination.
11:00-12:00 GENERAL FEEDBACK SESSION
(Lecture Hall)
A representative from each department will give a five-minute presentation describing their pod design, department rules and plans for noise control and teacher cooperation.
12:00- 1:00 FACULTY DE-BRIEFING
(Lecture Hall)
Presiding: Principal
Administrators will respond to pertinent questions and concerns.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 1980

8:00-10:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION: "DEPARTMENT AGENDA"
(Department Pods)
Presiding: Department Leaders
10:00-11:30 GENERAL SESSION: "PANEL ON SCHOOL-COMMUNITY COOPERATION"
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Principal
Speakers: Dept. of Parks & Rec. Director
Neighborhood Center Director
Assistant Principal (Parent Council Rep.)
11:30- 1:00 BUS TOUR OF COMMUNITY
Tour Guides: Principal & Asst. Principals

FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 1980

8:00-12:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION: "INVENTORY STORAGE AND MATERIAL DISTRIBUTION""
(Department Pods)
Presiding: Department Leaders
12:00- 1:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND PRINCIPAL'S AGENDA"
(Lecture Hall)
Presiding: Principal & Asst. Principals

MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 1980

8:00- 8:45 GENERAL SESSION: "KEY ISSUES IN PREPARING FOR A FLEXIBLE-SPACE COMMUNITY SCHOOL"
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Assistant Principal
Speaker: Dean of Education, Central University

MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 1978

8:00- 9:00 OPENING CEREMONIES
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Principal
Speakers: Mayor
Superintendent of Schools
9:00- 9:15 Coffee Break
9:15- 9:30 OVERVIEW OF SUMMER WORKSHOP PROGRAM
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Speaker: Supervisor of Program Development
9:30-10:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "SCHOOL DESIGN AND "GENERAL TRAFFIC FLOW"
(Lecture Hall)
Speaker: Principal
10:00-11:30 TOUR OF CITY COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL
Tour Guides: Level 1 - Assistant Principal
Level 2 - Assistant Principal
Level 3 - Assistant Principal
Upon completion of the tour, teachers will assemble in their department pods.
11:30- 1:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION: "Department Agenda"
(Department Pods)
"Department Leaders" will set each agenda and organize activities during all Department Work Sessions.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1978

8:00 -9:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "USE OF FLEXIBLE SPACE/SCHOOL RULES & REGULATIONS"
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Principal
9:00- 9:15 Coffee Break
9:15-10:00 GENERAL SESSION: "GUIDELINES FOR SPACE DESIGN, NOISE CONTROL & TRAFFIC FLOW"
Lecture Hall
Presiding: Program Coordinator
Speakers: City Community High School staff members
10:00- 1:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION
(Department Pods)
Faculty in each department will meet in pods to plan student traffic patterns and noise control and to set up learning stations (placement of furniture, display and storage areas).
12:30- 1:00 DEPARTMENT LEADERS MEETING: "ADMINISTRATORS WILL MEET WITH DEPARTMENT LEADERS REGARDING POD DESIGN"
(Principal's Conference Room-Level II)

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1978

8:00- 8:45 GENERAL SESSION: "GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT ORIENTATION, DISCIPLINE AND TEACHER COORDINATION IN FLEXIBLE SPACE"
(Lecture Hall - Level II)
Presiding: Program Coordinator
Speakers: City Community High School staff
8:45- 9:00 Coffee Break
9:00-11:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION
(Department Pods)
Faculty in each department will meet in pods to formulate department rules for student behavior, strategies for student orientation and teacher coordination.
11:00-12:00 GENERAL FEEDBACK SESSION
(Lecture Hall)
A representative from each department will give a five-minute presentation describing their pod design, department rules and plans for noise control and teacher cooperation.
12:00- 1:00 FACULTY DE-BRIEFING
(Lecture Hall)
Presiding: Principal
Administrators will respond to pertinent questions and concerns.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 1980

8:00-10:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION: "DEPARTMENT AGENDA"
(Department Pods)
Presiding: Department Leaders
10:00-11:30 GENERAL SESSION: "PANEL ON SCHOOL-COMMUNITY COOPERATION"
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Principal
Speakers: Dept. of Parks & Rec. Director
Neighborhood Center Director
Assistant Principal (Parent Council Rep.)
11:30- 1:00 BUS TOUR OF COMMUNITY
Tour Guides: Principal & Asst. Principals

FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 1980

8:00-12:00 DEPARTMENT WORK SESSION: "INVENTORY STORAGE AND MATERIAL DISTRIBUTION"
(Department Pods)
Presiding: Department Leaders
12:00- 1:00 FACULTY BRIEFING: "COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND PRINCIPAL'S AGENDA"
(Lecture Hall)
Presiding: Principal & Asst. Principals

MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 1980

8:00- 8:45 GENERAL SESSION: "KEY ISSUES IN PREPARING FOR A FLEXIBLE-SPACE COMMUNITY SCHOOL"
(Lecture Hall-Level II)
Presiding: Assistant Principal
Speaker: Dean of Education, Central University